arXiv:1610.01274v1 [math.DS] 5 Oct 2016

STATISTICAL PROPERTIES OF THE MAXIMAL ENTROPY MEASURE FOR PARTIALLY HYPERBOLIC ATTRACTORS

ARMANDO CASTRO AND TEÓFILO NASCIMENTO

Abstract. We show the existence and uniqueness of the maximal entropy probability measure for partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms which are semi-conjugate to nonuniformly expanding maps. Using the theory of projective metric on cones we then prove exponential decay of correlations for Hölder continuous observables and the central limit theorem for the maximal entropy probability measure. Moreover, for systems derived from solenoid we also prove the statistical stability for the maximal entropy probability measure. Finally, we use such techniques to obtain similar results in a context containing partially hyperbolic systems derived from Anosov.

1. Introduction

The thermodynamical formalism from the statistical mechanics was introduced in Dynamical Systems by the former works of Sinai, Ruelle and Bowen for uniformly hyperbolic maps and Hölder potentials, in the beginning of the 70's. Beyond the uniformly hyperbolic context, the theory is still quite incomplete. Several contribution do exist, for example [BK98, BF09, Yur03, OV08, SV09, BF09, Sar99, Cas02, VV10, LM13, CV13, MT14].

In the recent years, the thermodynamical formalism of a class of partial hyperbolic diffeomorphisms introduced by Alves, Bonatti, Viana [ABV00] and Castro [Cas98] has been developed under some conditions that resemble or may lead to some mostly expanding or mostly contracting assumption in the central direction.

In the non-invertible setting this has been studied by Castro, Oliveira, Varandas and Viana [OV08, VV10, CV13]. Given a compact metric space M and a local homeomorphism $f : M \to M$ in with Lipschitz inverse branches that admit some expanding and some possibly contracting domains of invertibility it was proved in [VV10] that for every Hölder continuous potential ϕ satisfying a small variation condition there are finitely many ergodic equilibrium states for f with respect to ϕ. Furthermore, the equilibrium states are absolutely continuous with respect to some conformal measure and there exists a unique equilibrium state provided that the dynamical system is topologically exact. Later on, using a functional analytic approach by means of projective metrics techniques to the study of the spectral properties of Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius operators on the space of $C^{r+\alpha}$ observables ($r \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha > 0$), Castro and Varandas [CV13] presented a more general proof for the uniqueness of equilibrium states for this class of maps and deduced many statistical

Date: October 6, 2016.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37A35, 37C30, 37C40, 37D25, 60F.

Key words and phrases. Thermodynamic Formalism, Partially Hyperbolic Systems, Transfer Operator.

properties as exponential decay of correlations, Central Limit Theorem, and also both statistical and spectral stabilities.

In this paper our motivation is to contribute to the study of the thermodynamical formalism of a large class of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms with strong stable foliation. We are interested in two different settings. The first setting consists in partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms which are semiconjugate to the class of local diffeomorphisms in [CV13]. The second setting consists in a class of partially hyperbolic attractors exhibiting a Markov partition (whose iterates need not have diameters going to zero). These settings include many examples of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms that arise as local bifurcations of Axiom A diffeomorphisms and will be mostly expanding with respect to some conformal measure, including a robust (open) class of systems derived from Anosov, introduced by Mañé in [Mane78].

SRB measures for large classes of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms have been constructed by [Car93, ABV00, BV00, Cas98] and existence and uniqueness of maximal entropy measures have been proved by Buzzi, Fisher, Sambarino, Vasquez [BFSV12] for derived from Anosov diffeomorphisms, by Buzzi, Fisher [BF13] for wide class of deformations of Anosov diffeomorphisms that include some examples by Bonatti and Viana of robustly transitive non-partiallly hyperbolic diffeomorphisms, and by Ures [Ur12] for partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms of $\mathbb{T}^3$ homotopic to a hyperbolic automorphism. In most of these cases the approach is to establish a semiconjugacy between the dynamical system and some uniformly hyperbolic one and prove that the points that remain in a non-hyperbolic region do not contribute much for the topological entropy. More recently, Climenhaga, Fisher and Thompson [CFT15] proved the uniqueness for equilibrium states for some robust classes of examples of [Mane78] and [BV00]. The drawback is that these methods are not enough to deduce some good statistical properties for the original dynamical system, specially the exponential decay of correlations. To illustrate this fact let us mention that in the case of nonuniformly expanding maps the Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius transfer operator acts in the space of Hölder continuous functions and the dominant eigenvector of its adjoint operator leads to the measure of maximal entropy, while in the invertible context any invariant measure is an eigenvector for the adjoint operator. For that reason the method of invariant cones used in [CV13] could not be applied here. In fact, the results and their proofs in this paper here are independent from those in the above mentioned paper, except that we use the existence and uniqueness of the entropy maximizing measure there to guarantee the uniqueness in this new context.

So, to deduce exponential decay of correlations for the original dynamical systems we introduce a suitable Banach space and prove that the transfer operator does preserve some cone of functions. The construction of such cone of functions is done by constructing a family of probability measures on stable leaves that is equidistributed and holonomy invariant. A very laborious work is done in order to prove the invariance of such suitable cone of functions by the transfer operator and that the image of this by the transfer operator has finite diameter in the projective metrics, which implies that transfer operator is a contraction with respect to the projective metrics. From that and the duality properties of transfer and Koopman operators we derive the exponential decay of correlations and the Central Limit Theorem as a consequence.

It is worth to mention other recent works (e.g. [BL12, Mel14, LT15]) concerning fast mixing of SRB and Gibbs measures, in some nonuniformly hyperbolic settings. The techniques used in such papers are either compactness arguments provided by Lasota-Yorke estimates, or Young Towers [You98] and operator renewal theory. Even though such techniques have the advantage to reach a kind of spectral gap for transfer operator rather directly, they need asymptotic assumptions, and stronger transitivity assumptions than the Cone approach. For instance, the nontransitive situation that we obtain by bifurcating the Manneville-Poumeau map so that we create a sink can not be properly worked out by a Lasota-Yorke approach. However, the method of invariant cones for transfer operators, used e.g. in [CV13], easily contemplates such example without any addititional hipothesis. The approach here also gathers the same advantage of a kind of mild transitivity assumptions such as in [CV13]. So, our paper deals with different and robust classes of examples that are not under the hypotheses of the previous cited works.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we give precise definitions of the family of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms that we consider and state the main results. Some robust class of examples is also discussed. In sections 3 and 4, we establish the existence and uniqueness of equlibrium states. and, restricting to the skew-products and derived from solenoid case, in section 5, we also prove statistical stability of the equilibrium states, meaning that the measure varies continuously in the weak* topology with the dynamics and the potential. In the remaining sections up to section 10, we prove that the maximal entropy measure satisfies good statistical properties, namely exponential decay of correlations and the Central Limit Theorem in the space of Hölder continuous observables. In the last section 11, we apply the methods that we developed for the case of partially hyperbolic attractors with Markov partition, including some robust classes of attractors derived from Anosov introduced by Mañé [Mane78].

2. Context and statement of the main results

In this paper, we will work with two contexts of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms with strong stable direction. We deal with partially hyperbolic systems that are semiconjugate to nonuniformly expanding endormorphisms (see [CV13]) and with diffeomorphisms that include systems derived from Anosov. Although both classes of dynamical systems presents a partially hyperbolic behaviour, the study of their thermodynamical properties require different approaches due to crucial geometrical differences.

First Setting. Let N be a connected compact Riemannian manifold, and let $g : N \to N$ be a *local homeomorphism* with Lipschitz inverse branches. For that, we mean there exists $L(x) \geq 0$ such that, for all $x \in N$ has a neighborhood $U_x \ni x$ such that $g_x := g|_{U_x} : U_x \to g(U_x)$ is invertible and

$$d(g_x^{-1}(y), g_x^{-1}(z)) \leq L(x)\, d(y, z), \quad \forall y, z \in g(U_x). \tag{2.1}$$

Let us denote by $\deg(g)$ the degree of g, which coincides with the number of preimages of any $x \in N$ by g. We also assume that there exist $0 < \lambda_u < 1$ and an open region $\Omega \subset N$ such that

(H1) $L(x) \leq L$ for $x \in \Omega$ and $L(x) < \lambda_u$ for $x \notin \Omega$, for some L close to 1.

(H2) There exists a covering $\mathcal{U}$ of N by injective domain of g, such that Ω can be covered by $q < \deg(g)$ elements of $\mathcal{U}$.

Let M be a compact invariant manifold, and $f : M \to M$ a diffeomorphism onto its image. Suppose there exists a continuous and sujective $\Pi : M \to N$ such that

$$\Pi \circ f = g \circ \Pi. \tag{2.2}$$

Given $y \in N$, set $M_y = \Pi^{-1}(y)$. Therefore, $M = \bigcup_{y \in N} M_y$. Note that $f(M_y) \subset M_{g(y)}$, and also suppose that there exists $0 < \lambda_s < 1$ such that

$$d(f(z), f(w)) \leq \lambda_s d(z, w) \tag{2.3}$$

for all $z, w \in M_y$.

As the maximizing entropy measure is f-invariant, by Poincaré's Recurrence Theorem such measure is supported in the attractor

$$\Lambda := \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} f^n(M).$$

Note that Λ is compact and invariant by f. So, it is sufficient to study the dynamics of f restricted to Λ.

Given $x, y \in M$, write $\hat{x} := \Pi(x)$, $\hat{y} := \Pi(y)$. We assume that there exist holonomies $\pi_{\hat{x},\hat{y}} : M_{\hat{x}} \cap \Lambda \to M_{\hat{y}} \cap \Lambda$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{C}\left[d_N(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) + d_M(\pi_{\hat{x},\hat{y}}(x), y)\right] \leq d_M(x, y) \leq C\left[d_N(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) + d_M(\pi_{\hat{x},\hat{y}}(x), y)\right] \tag{2.4}$$

for some constant $C > 0$, and d_M, d_N to be the metrics of M,N, respectively. For simplicity we shall write d for any of such metrics.

We suppose such holonomies are invariant by f, that is,

$$f\left(\pi_{\hat{x},\hat{y}}(z)\right) = \pi_{g(\hat{x}),g(\hat{y})}\left(f(z)\right) \tag{2.5}$$

for all $z \in M_{\hat{x}} \cap \Lambda$.

Second Setting. Let M be a compact Riemannian manifold and $f : M \to M$ be a C^{1+}diffeomorphism. Assume that there exists a compact subset Λ of M with the following properties:

(1) There exists an open $f-$invariant neighborhood Q of Λ, such that $f(\overline{Q}) \subset Q$ and

$$\Lambda = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} f^n(Q).$$

(2) Λ is partially hyperbolic, in the sense that there exists a Df-invariant dominated splitting

$$T_\Lambda M = E^{ss} \oplus E^{uc}, dim(E^{ss}) > 0$$

of the tangent bundle restricted to Λ, such that, once fixed a Riemannian metrics in M we have:

(a) E^{ss} contracts uniformly: $\|Df^n|E^{ss}_x\| \leq C\lambda_s^n$

(b) E^{uc} is dominated by E^{ss}: $\|Df^n|E^{ss}_x\|\|Df^{-n}|E^{uc}_{f^n(x)}\| \leq C\lambda_s^n$

for all $n \geq 1$ and $x \in \Lambda$, with $0 < \lambda_s < 1$.

(3) There exists an f-invariant center-unstable foliation $\mathcal{F}^{uc}_{loc}$ of a neighborhood Λ, which is tangent to the center unstable subbundle E^{uc} in Λ. There is also an $f-$invariant stable foliation $\mathcal{F}^{s}_{loc}$ tangent to the stable subbundle E^{ss} in Λ.

In order to proceed with our considerations on the dynamics f, we recall the concept of Markov Partition in this partially hyperbolic context.

Definition 2.1. We say that $R \subset \Lambda$ is a Markov **proper rectangle**, if forall x and y in R there exists a unique point $z := [x, y] \in R$ which is the intersection between the local (strong) stable manifold passing by x, and the local center unstable manifold passing by y. Moreover, R is the closure of its interior (in the relative topology of Λ) and, in particular, is closed.

We observe that the boundary of Markov proper rectangles are union of local (strong) stable manifolds and local center-unstable manifolds.

Definition 2.2. A collection $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \cdots, R_p\}$ of proper rectangles is a *Markov Partition* for f restricted to Λ, if:

(a) $\Lambda = \bigcup_{i=1}^{p} R_i$;

(b) $int\,(R_i) \cap int\,(R_j) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$;

(c) If γ is the intersection of a local (strong) stable manifold with R_i and $f(\gamma) \cap R_j \neq \emptyset$ then $f(\gamma) \subset R_j$. Analogously, if Γ is the intersection of a local center unstable manifold with R_i and $f^{-1}(\Gamma) \cap R_k \neq \emptyset$ then $f^{-1}(\Gamma) \subset R_k$.

(4) f restricted to Λ admits a Markov partition $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \cdots, R_p\}$, $p \geq 2$ with the (mild) mixing property: given $i, j \in \{1, \cdots, p\}$, there exists $n_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$f^n(R_i) \cap R_j \neq \emptyset, \forall n \geq n_0.$$

We distinguish two kinds of rectangles in $\mathcal{R}$ according to its behavior in the direction E^{uc}. Fixed $0 < \zeta < 1$, we say $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$ is a *good rectangle* if

$$\|Df|_{E^{uc}_x}\|^{-1} \leq \zeta$$

for all $x \in R_i$. That is, E^{uc} expands uniformly in R_i, for one iterate. The other rectangles will be called bad rectangles.

(5) There exists at least one good rectangle and for all x in a bad rectangle

$$\|Df|_{E^{uc}_x}\|^{-1} \leq L$$

for some $L \geq 1$ close to 1 (depending on ζ and the combinatorics of the partition).

2.1. **Statement of the main results.** We recall the definition of topological entropy due to Bowen, using (n, ϵ)-separable sets. A compact set K contained in a metric space (X, d) is (n, ϵ)-separable if

$$\forall x, y \in K, x \neq y, \max\left\{d(f^j(x), d(f^j(y)); j = 0, \cdots, n-1\right\} > \epsilon$$

We denote by $S(n, \epsilon, K)$ the greatest cardinality of a (n, ϵ)-separate subset of K. The *relative entropy* of f with respect to a (not necessarily invariant) compact

$K \subset X$, is given by

$$h(f, K) := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log S(n, \epsilon, K).$$

For a uniformly continuous map $f : X \to X$, (X not necessarily compact), the *topological entropy* is defined by

$$h(f) := \sup \{h(f, K); K \text{ compact } \}$$

In our context $X = \Lambda$ is a compact set, and f is automaticaly uniformly continuous. We also have by [W93] that $h(f) = h(f, X)$ does not depend on the metrics.

For an invariant measure μ, we also recall the definition by Kolmogorov of its metric entropy $h_\mu(f)$. Given a probability space $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, if μ is f-invariant, we define the entropy of a finite of a finite partition $\mathcal{P}$ of X by:

$$h_\mu(\mathcal{P}) := -\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mu(P) \log \mu(P).$$

Then the entropy of a partition with respect to f is

$$h_\mu(f, \mathcal{P}) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} h_\mu(\mathcal{P} \vee f^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) \vee \cdots \vee f^{n-1}(\mathcal{P})).$$

and the metric entropy of f with respect to μ is given by

$$h_\mu(f) := \sup_{\mathcal{P}} \{h_\mu(f, \mathcal{P})\}.$$

Denote by $\mathcal{M}_f^1(X)$ the set of all $f-$invariant probabilities. The *variational principle* stablishes, that for a continuous map f on a compact metric space X, the equation

$$h(f) = \sup \left\{h_\mu(f); \mu \in \mathcal{M}_f^1(X)\right\}$$

holds. We say that an invariant probability μ is a *maximal entropy measure* for f if $h(f) = h_\mu(f)$. We now state the main results in this work:

Theorem A. ***(Existence and Uniqueness of Maximal Entropy measure.)*** *Let $f : \Lambda \to \Lambda$ a diffeomorphism in the first setting, as described in section 2 (that is, the conditions given by equations 2.2 through 2.5). Then, there exists a unique maximal entropy measure μ for f.*

As a by-product of the proof we also obtain

Corollary 2.3. ***(Statistical Stability in the Derived from Solenoid case.)*** *Let f_n be a sequence of derived from solenoid diffeomorphisms (see example 2.7) and call μ_n the maximal entropy probability measure for f_n. If $f_n \to f$ in the C^1-topology, then μ_n converges to the maximal entropy probability measure for f in the weak-* topology.*

Using the theory of projective metrics over invariant cones, we prove:

Theorem B. ***(Exponential Decay of Correlations)*** *The maximal measure entropy μ for $f : \Lambda \to \Lambda$ has exponential decay of correlations for Hölder continuous observables, that is, there exists some $0 < \tau < 1$ such that for α-Hölder continuous φ, ψ there exists $K(\varphi, \psi) > 0$ satisfying*

$$\left| \int (\varphi \circ f^n) \psi d\nu - \int \varphi d\nu \int \psi d\nu \right| \leq K(\varphi, \psi) \cdot \tau^n, \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

For the maximal entropy measure μ the following theorem also holds:

Theorem C. ***(Central Limit Theorem)***

Let μ be the maximal entropy measure for $f : \Lambda \to \Lambda$, as in (2.2) and let φ be a Hölder continuous function. If

$$\sigma_\varphi^2 := \int \phi^2 d\mu + 2\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int \phi \cdot (\phi \circ f^j)\, d\mu, \qquad with \qquad \phi = \varphi - \int \varphi\, d\mu,$$

then $\sigma_\varphi < \infty$ and $\sigma_\varphi = 0$ if, and only if, $\varphi = u \circ f - u$ for some $u \in L^2(\mu)$. Moreover, if $\sigma_\varphi > 0$ then, for all interval $A \subset \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mu\left(x \in M : \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left(\varphi(f^j(x)) - \int \varphi d\mu \right) \in A \right) = \frac{1}{\sigma_\varphi \sqrt{2\pi}} \int_A e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma_\varphi^2}} dt$$

holds.

In what follows, we shall describe the results the results for the class of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms considered in the Second Setting. In this other context, we construct a dominant eigenmeasure μ for the dual of the transfer operator acting in a suitable space of distributions. We then prove:

Theorem D. *The measure μ exhibits exponential decay of correlations in the space of Hölder continuous observables . Furthermore, the Central Limit Theorem holds for the measure μ.*

We note that, even in the second setting, the Markov Partition permits us to construct a quotient map from the original one (see page 42 for the precise definition). In the cases in which the maximizing entropy measure exists and is unique for the quotient system, one can repeat the arguments in Theorem A to conclude that the measure μ is the (unique) maximal entropy measure for the system (f, Λ).

In particular, by using [LSV98], we obtain:

Corollary 2.4. *Let f be a system satisfying (1) through (5) of the Second Setting. Suppose also that the center-unstable spaces of f are one-dimensional. Then f has a unique maximizing entropy measure, which has exponential decay of correlations and satisfies the Central Limit Theorem for Hölder continuous observables.*

2.2. **Some Examples.**

Let us start with examples of the first setting.

Example 2.5. The most simple family of examples is a skew-product obtained from a map $g : N \to N$ as in [CV13] (this means that g can be taken in a robust class of nonuniformly expanding maps that, in particular, includes all expanding maps) and an endomorphism $\Phi : N \times K \to K$, by the formula

$$\begin{array}{rccc} f: & N \times K & \to & N \times K \\ & (x, y) & \mapsto & (g(x), \Phi(x, y)) \end{array}$$

such that f is a diffeomorphism onto its image, and for each $x \in N$, $\Phi(x, \cdot) : K \to K$ is a λ_s-contraction. In such case, Π is the canonical projection in the first coordinate, and $N \times K = \bigcup_{x\in N} K_x$, where $K_x = \{x\} \times K$ forall $x \in N$.

Example 2.6. As a subexample, we may take the solenoid generated in the solid torus $S^1 \times D$. We define f by

$$\begin{array}{rccl} f: & S^1 \times D & \to & S^1 \times D \\ & (\theta, z) & \mapsto & (g(\theta), \varphi(\theta) + A(z)) \end{array}$$

where g is the Manneville-Pomeau map given by

$$g(\theta) = \begin{cases} \theta(1 + 2^\alpha \theta^\alpha) & , \text{ if } 0 \leq \theta \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ (\theta - 1)(1 + 2^\alpha (1 - \theta)^\alpha) + 1 & , \text{ if } \frac{1}{2} < \theta \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, φ is a local diffeomorphism and A is a contraction.

Example 2.7. One can modify the examples above in order to obtain robust (containing an open set) classes of examples. These are examples derived from solenoid-like systems. For sake of simplicity, we will give a construction in dimension four, which can be easily adapted to similar higher dimensional examples.

Let us begin with a solenoid-like C^2-skew-product hyperbolic diffeomorphism $f_0 : T^2 \times D \to T^2 \times D$ similar to the examples 1 and 2 above. We suppose that

$$\begin{array}{rccl} f_0: & T^2 \times D & \to & T^2 \times D \\ & (x, y) & \mapsto & (g_0(x), \Phi_0(x, y)) \end{array}$$

is such that g_0 is an expanding map.

We suppose that the norm of Df_0 along the stable subbundle and the norm of Df_0^{-1} along the unstable bundle are bounded by a constant $\lambda_0 < 1/3$. Let p be a fixed point of f_0 and let $\delta > 0$ be a small constant. Denote $V_0 = B(p, \delta/2)$. Then, in the same manner as in [Cas02], we deform f_0^{-1} inside V_0 by a isotopy obtaining a continuous family of maps $f_t, 0 < t < 2$ in such a way that

i) The continuation p_{f_t} of the fixed point p goes through some generic bifurcation such as a flip bifurcation or a Hopf bifurcation. Points of different indexes appear in a transitive attractor for values of t between 1 and 2 (staying all the time inside V_0). For $t = 1$ we have the first moment of the Hopf (or flip) bifurcation, with f_1 conjugated to f_0. We suppose that the derivative $Df_1|_{E^{cu}}$ does not contract vectors. In the case of Hopf bifurcation, we suppose that $Df_t|_{E^{cu}}(p_{f_t})$ exhibits complex eigenvalues, for all t;

ii) In the process, there always exist a strong- stable cone field C^{ss} (cf. [Vi97] for definitions) and a center-unstable cone field C^{cu}, defined everywhere, such that C^{cu} contains the unstable direction of the initial map f_0; We also suppose that there exists a continuation of the torus $T^2 \times \{0\}$ which is f_0-invariant and normally hyperbolic. So, for each $t \in [1, 2]$ there exists a f_t-invariant manifold T_t that is the normally hyperbolic continuation of $T^2 \times \{0\}$.

iii) Moreover, the width of the cone fields C^{ss} and C^{cu} are bounded by a small constant $\alpha > 0$.

iv) There exist a constant $\sigma > 1$ and a neighbourhood $V_1 \subset V_0 \cap W^s(p)$, such that $J^c = \|detDf_t^{-1}|_{E^{cu}}\| > \sigma$ outside V_1;

v) The maps f_t^{-1} is $\delta - C^0$ close to f_0^{-1} outside V_0 so that $\|(Df_1^{-1}|_{E^{cu}})\| < \lambda_0 < 1/3$ outside V_0.

Note that the properties stated in conditions i) through v), which are valid for $f_t, 0 \leq t \leq 2$, are also valid for a whole C^1-neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of the set of

diffeomorphisms $\{f_t, 0 \leq t \leq 2\}$. In particular, by [HPS77] conditions i) through iii) imply that any $f \in \mathcal{U}$ has an invariant central foliation, since the central cone field enables us to define a graph transform associated to it, with domain in the space of foliations tangent to C^{cu}, which is not empty, since the unstable foliation of f_0 is tangent to it. On the other hand, all $f \in \mathcal{U}$ also exhibits a strong stable foliation varying continuously with the diffeomorphism.

As a consequence of lemma 6.1 of [BV00] there is a C^1-neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}_1 \subset \mathcal{U}$ of the set $\{f_t, 1 < t \leq 2\}$ such that for all $f \in \mathcal{U}_1$, $\Lambda = T^n$ is a partially hyperbolic attractor, which is not hyperbolic, because it is transitive and contains points with different indexes.

One can embed $T^2 \times D$ as a subset of T^4. So, it is easy to extend f_t above to T^4 in a manner that each f_t is hyperbolic (and structurally stable) outside $T^2 \times D$. So, we will assume each f_t defined in T^4 in such way.

Now take f in some small ball $B = B(f_1, \delta'), \delta' < \delta/2$. Suppose also that δ' is sufficiently small such that all diffeomorphism in $B(f_1, \delta') \subset \mathcal{U}$ is partially hyperbolic. So, if $\delta' > 0$ is small, $B(f_1, \delta')$ is an open set of diffeomorphisms of T^4 satisfying the conditions in section 2.

Corollary 2.8. *There exists an open set of non-hyperbolic diffeomorphisms $f : T^4 \to T^4$ satisfying conditions expressed by equations 2.2 through 2.5.*

Proof. Just take the open set of diffeomorphisms $\mathcal{U}_2 = \mathcal{U}_1 \cap B(f_1, \delta')$, δ' as in the proposition above. Conditions in equations 2.2-2.5 fit for every diffeomorphism in a ball $B(f_1, \delta')$. □

Example 2.9 (Derived from Anosov). Mañé [Mane78] has introduced a robust class of partially hyperbolic attractors by a pitchfork or Hopf bifurcation of some periodic orbit. In [Cas02] the author proved that a robust class of maps satisfying conditions (1) through (5), can be obtained. In fact, let $g : M \to M$ as in example 2) in [Cas02] of a system derived from Anosov. Taking $f = g^{-1}$, the strong unstable (E^{uu}) and center stable (E^{cs}) subbundles of g become respectively the strong stable subbundle (E^{ss}) and center-unstable subbundle (E^{uc}) for f, and such f satisfies (1) through (5).

3. Construction of the Maximal Entropy Measure

Due to the contraction in the stable foliation, the dynamics of distinct orbits of $f : M \to M$ will be determined by the dynamical behavior of the map $g : N \to N$. As seen in [CV13], such map g has only a unique maximal entropy measure, which we will denote by ν.

We start the construction of the maximal entropy measure for f by defininig it on measurable sets of the form $\Pi^{-1}(A)$, where A is a Borelian set of N.

Since Π is a semiconjugation, by [W93] one obtain that,

$$h(f) \geq h(g).$$

Moreover, due to Bowen [Bow71] it follows that

$$h(f) \leq h(g) + \sup\{h(f, \Pi^{-1}(y)); y \in N\}$$

We now prove that $h(f, \Pi^{-1}(y)) = 0$ for all $y \in N$. Indeed, since $f : M_y \to M_{g(y)}$ is a λ_s-contraction, given $\epsilon > 0$, the only (n, ϵ)-separate subsets restricted to M_y are unitary subsets. As $\Pi^{-1}(y)$ can be writen as a union of $m(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ balls of ϵ-diameter,

we conclude that the cardinality of any (n,ϵ)-separate subset of $\Pi^{-1}(y)$ is at most $m(\epsilon)$. By the definition entropy due to Bowen, this implies $h(f,\Pi^{-1}(y))=0$ for all $y\in N$. Therefore, $h(f)\leq h(g)$, and so $h(f)=h(g)$.

This allows us to construct the maximal entropy measure for f from the one for g. In fact, denote by ν the unique maximal entropy measure built in [CV13]. Due to the variational principle and the fact of $h(f)=h(g)$, it follows that $h_\nu(g)$, is greater than, or equal to the metric entropy of any $f-$invariant probability. So, for the proof of existence part of the statement, it is sufficient to obtain an f-invariant probablity μ, whose metric entropy with respect to f is greater or equal than $h_\nu(g)=h(g)$.

For that purpose, let $\Pi_\Lambda=\Pi|_\Lambda$. Let $\mathcal{A}_N$ be the Borel σ-algebra on N. Clearly, $\mathcal{A}_0:=\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_N)$ is a σ-algebra on Λ. Since f is a bijection in Λ and $\Pi_\Lambda\circ f=g\circ\Pi_\Lambda$, we have

$$A=\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(B)=f\circ\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}\circ g^{-1}(B).$$

As $g^{-1}(B)$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}_N$, it follows that $\mathcal{A}_0\subset f(\mathcal{A}_0)$ and therefore $\mathcal{A}_n:=f^n(\mathcal{A}_0)$ is a sequence of σ-algebras such that $\mathcal{A}_0\subset\mathcal{A}_1\subset\cdots\subset\mathcal{A}_n\subset\cdots$. Define $\mu_n:\mathcal{A}_n\to[0,1]$ by $\mu_n(f^n(A_0))=\nu(\Pi_\Lambda(A_0))$, for all $A_0\in\mathcal{A}_0$. Note that μ_n is an f-invariant probability for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$. In fact, given $A=f^n(A_0)$, where $A_0=\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(B)$ and $B\in\mathcal{A}_N$, due to the g-invariance of ν and the surjection of maps g and Π_Λ, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_n(f^{-1}(A)) &= \mu_n(f^{-1}(f^n(A_0)))=\mu_n(f^n(f^{-1}(A_0)))\\ &= \nu(\Pi_\Lambda(f^{-1}(A_0)))=\nu(\Pi_\Lambda(f^{-1}\circ\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(B)))\\ &= \nu(\Pi_\Lambda(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}\circ g^{-1}(B)))=\nu(g^{-1}(B))\\ &= \nu(B)=\nu(\Pi_\Lambda(A_0))=\mu_n(f^n(A_0))=\mu_n(A)\end{aligned}$$

Now, as $\mathcal{A}_n\subset\mathcal{A}_{n+1}$, $\mathcal{A}:=\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty}\mathcal{A}_n$ is an algebra in Λ.

Then we define $\mu:\mathcal{A}\to[0,1]$ the probability such that $\mu(A)=\mu_n(A)$ if $A\in\mathcal{A}_n$. By the standard measure theory arguments(see [Mane]), μ is σ-aditive. Moreover, μ is an f-invariant probability, as μ_n are f-invariant probabilities. It rests to prove that the smallest $\sigma-$algebra that contains $\mathcal{A}$ is the Borel $\sigma-$algebra.

For that, it is sufficient to see that $\mathcal{A}$ contains a sequence of partitions whose diameter goes to zero.

This is because $f:M_y\to M_{g(y)}$ is a λ_s-contraction.

In fact, for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, by the continuity of g^n, there exists $\delta(n)>0$ such that $d(z,w)<\delta(n)$ implies $d(g^n(z),g^n(w))<\lambda_s^n$, for all $z,w\in N$. Taking $\mathcal{P}_n^0$ a partition of N whose diameter is less than $\delta(n)$, we define a sequence of partitions of Λ by

$$\mathcal{P}_n:=f^n\left(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_n^0\right)\right) \tag{3.1}$$

Clearly, $\operatorname{diam}(\mathcal{P}_n)\to 0$ as $n\to+\infty$. Indeed, given $\bar{x},\bar{y}$ in the same element of $\mathcal{P}_n$, writing $\bar{x}=f^n(x)$ and $\bar{y}=f^n(y)$ we have $\hat{x}=\Pi(x),\hat{y}=\Pi(y)\in P_n^0$. Therefore, noting that $g^n(\hat{x})=g^n(\Pi(x))=\Pi(f^n(x))=\tilde{x}$ and $g^n(\hat{y})=g^n(\Pi(y))=\Pi(f^n(y))=\tilde{y}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}d(f^n(x),f^n(y)) &\leq C\left[d(\tilde{x},\tilde{y})+d(\pi_{\tilde{x},\tilde{y}}\circ f^n(x),f^n(y))\right]\\ &= C\left[d(g^n\circ\Pi(x),g^n\circ\Pi(y))+d(f^n(\pi_{\hat{x},\hat{y}}(x)),f^n(y))\right]\\ &\leq C\left[\lambda_s^n+\lambda_s^n d(\pi_{\hat{x},\hat{y}}(x),y)\right]\leq C\left[1+diam(M)\right]\lambda_s^n.\end{aligned}$$

By a slight abuse of notation, we also write μ for its natural extension to the Borel σ-algebra of M.

Now we prove that μ is a maximizing entropy measure for f, by proving that $h_\mu(f) \geq h_\nu(g)$. Denote by $B_\epsilon^n(g, y_0)$ a (n, ϵ)-dynamical ball of g around $y_0 \in N$, that is, the set of points $y \in N$, such that $d(g^j(y), g^j(y_0)) < \epsilon, \forall j \in \{0, \cdots, n-1\}$. Due Brin-Katok Theorem, ν-a.e. point $y \in N$,

$$h_\nu(g) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{\nu\left(B_\epsilon^n(g, y)\right)}$$

holds.

Take now $B_\epsilon^n(f, x)$ the (n, ϵ) dynamical ball of f restricted to Λ at $x \in \Lambda$. By the uniform continuity of Π, given $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $0 < \delta < \epsilon$ such that $\Pi(B_\delta(w)) \subset B_\epsilon(\Pi(w))$ for all $w \in M$. Note that $B_\delta^n(f, x) \subset \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}\left(B_\epsilon^n(g, y)\right)$ for all $x \in \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(y)$.

In fact, given $z \in B_\delta^n(f, x)$ we shall prove that $\Pi(z) \in B_\epsilon^n(g, y)$. As $\Pi(x) = y$ we have for all $j \in \{0, \cdots, n-1\}$

$$d(g^j \circ \Pi(z), g^j(y)) \quad = \quad d(g^j \circ \Pi(z), g^j \circ \Pi(x)) = d(\Pi \circ f^j(z), \Pi \circ f^j(x)) < \epsilon.$$

Therefore

$$\mu\left(B_\delta^n(f, x)\right) \leq \mu\left(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}\left(B_\epsilon^n\left(g, y\right)\right)\right) = \nu\left(B_\epsilon^n\left(g, y\right)\right)$$

and since $\delta \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$ we obtain

$$h_\nu(g) \leq \lim_{\delta \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{\mu\left(B_\delta^n(f, x)\right)}$$

for $\mu-$a.e. $x \in \Lambda$. So,

$$h_\mu(f) \quad = \quad \int_\Lambda \lim_{\delta \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{1}{\mu\left(B_\delta^n(f, x)\right)} d\mu \geq \int_\Lambda h_\nu(g) d\mu = \ h_\nu(g)$$

and we conclude that $h_\mu(f) \geq h_\nu(g) = h(g) = h(f)$, which is the equivalent to say that μ is maximal entropy measure for f.

4. Uniqueness of Maximal Entropy Measure

Now we prove the uniqueness of maximal entropy measure for f built in the last section. For such purpose, we use the uniqueness of the maximal entropy measure for g, provided by [CV13]. Suppose that μ_1 is another invariant maximal entropy measure for f, different to μ. Let $\nu_1 := (\Pi_\Lambda)_* \mu_1$, the push-forward of μ_1.

We claim that since μ_1 is different to μ, it follows that ν_1 is different to ν. Indeed, since $\mu_1 \neq \mu$, $\mu_1(A) \neq \mu(A)$ for some $A \in \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_0 \cup f(\mathcal{A}_0) \cup \cdots \cup f^n(\mathcal{A}_0) \cup \cdots$. The fact that such algebras on $\mathcal{P}(\Lambda)$ are nested implies that exist $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f^n(A_0) = A$. By the definition of $\mathcal{A}_0$, there exists $B_0 \in \mathcal{A}_N$ such that $\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(B_0) = A_0$. We now observe that, on one hand,

$$\nu_1(B_0) = (\Pi_\Lambda)_* \mu_1(B_0) = \mu_1(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(B_0)) = \mu_1(A_0) = \mu_1(f^n(A_0)) = \mu_1(A)$$

and on the other hand,

$$\nu(B_0) = \nu(\Pi_\Lambda(A_0)) = \mu(A_0) = \mu(f^n(A_0)) = \mu(A).$$

So, $\nu_1 \neq \nu$. By the f-invariance of μ_1 it follow that ν_1 is g-invariant.

Let us prove that ν_1 is a maximal entropy measure for g, which is a contradiction, since by [CV13], such probability is unique. For that, it is sufficient to prove that $h_{\nu_1}(g) \geq h_{\mu_1}(f)$, since $h_{\mu_1}(f) = h(f) = h(g)$.

In fact, we may suppose that the sequence $\mathcal{P}_n = f^n\left(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_n^0\right)\right)$, in 3.1, is such that $\mathcal{P}_0 \leq \mathcal{P}_1 \leq \cdots \leq \mathcal{P}_n \leq \cdots$ and as $\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_n$ generates the Borel σ-algebra of Λ, we obtain

$$h_{\mu_1}(f) = \sup_n \left\{h_{\mu_1}(f, P_n)\right\}.$$

Therefore, for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $n \in N$ such that

$$h_{\mu_1}(f, P_n) \geq h_{\mu_1}(f) - \epsilon.$$

However, if follows from the definition of ν_1 that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$h_{\nu_1}(g, P_n^0) = h_{\mu_1}(f, \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}\left(P_n^0\right)).$$

Indeed, for a partition $\mathcal{P}$ we have

$$h_{\nu_1}(g, \mathcal{P}) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{1}{m} h_{\nu_1}\left(\mathcal{P} \vee g^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) \vee \cdots \vee g^{-(m-1)}(\mathcal{P})\right)$$

Due to the definition of ν_1 and the semiconjugation between f and g we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_1\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{m-1} g^{-j}(P_{i_j})\right) &= \mu_1\left(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{m-1} g^{-j}(P_{i_j})\right)\right) \\
&= \mu_1\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{m-1} f^{-j}\left(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(P_{i_j})\right)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

which guarantees $h_{\nu_1}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{m-1} g^{-j}(\mathcal{P})\right) = h_{\mu_1}\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{m-1} f^{-j}\left(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(\mathcal{P})\right)\right)$ and so, we have

$$h_{\nu_1}(g, \mathcal{P}) = h_{\mu_1}(f, \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(\mathcal{P})).$$

From the f-invariance of μ_1 it follows that

$$h_{\mu_1}(f, \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}\left(\mathcal{P}_n^0\right)) = h_{\mu_1}(f, \mathcal{P}_n)$$

because $P_{n_j} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ if and only if there exist $P_{n_j}^0 \in \mathcal{P}_n^0$ such that $P_{n_j} = f^n(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(P_{n_j}^0))$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_1\left(\textstyle\bigvee_{j=0}^{m-1} f^{-j}(P_{n_j})\right) &= \mu_1\left(\textstyle\bigvee_{j=0}^{m-1} f^{-j}\left(f^n\left(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(P_{n_j}^0)\right)\right)\right) \\
&= \mu_1\left(\textstyle\bigvee_{j=0}^{m-1} f^{-j}\left(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(P_{n_j}^0)\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We then obtain that for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{\nu_1}(g) &\geq h_{\nu_1}\left(g, P_n^0\right) = h_{\mu_1}\left(f, \Pi_\Lambda^{-1} P_n^0\right) \\
&= h_{\mu_1}(f, P_n) \geq h_{\mu_1}(f) - \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

and this proves that $h_{\nu_1}(g) \geq h_{\mu_1}(f)$, and the uniqueness of the maximal entropy measure.

5. Statistical Stability

Now we prove the statistical stability for the maximizing probability measure μ. That is, given $f_n \to f$ in the C^1-topology, then $\mu_n \to \mu$ in weak-$*$ topology, where μ_n (respectively, μ) is the maximizing entropy measure for f_n (respectively, f).

Let us fix such f, and consider the collection $\mathcal{C}$ whose elements are open subsets $A \subset M$ whose frontier are μ-zero sets with the form $A = \cup_{x\in B} M_x$, for some ball $B \subset N$ with ν-zero frontier. Also denote by $\hat{\mathcal{C}} \supset \mathcal{C}$ the collection whose elements are nonnegative interate of some element of $\mathcal{C}$. Observe that, if we fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $f^k(\cup_{x\in N} M_x)$ is a neighborhood for the attractors Λ_n where μ_n are supported, for all sufficiently big n. Note that $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ is a neighborhood basis for Λ.

The key ingredient for the proof is the lemma:

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\hat{A} \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}$. Then $\mu_n(\hat{A}) \to \mu(\hat{A})$ as $n \to +\infty$.*

Proof. Given $\hat{A} = f^k(A)$, with $A = \cup_{x\in B} M_x$. We start with the case $k = 0$, that is, first we prove that $\mu_n(A) \to \mu(A)$ as $n \to +\infty$.

Set $A_n := \Pi_n^{-1}(B)$. Therefore, $\mu_n(A_n) = \nu_n(B)$, where ν_n is the maximizing measure g_n as in [CV13]. We also have $\mu(A) = \nu(B)$, where ν is the entropy maximizing probability associated to g, as in [CV13].

Given $\epsilon > 0$, take $B^+ \supset B \supset B^-$, $\nu-$zero frontier such that

$$\nu(B^+) - \epsilon/3 < \nu(B) < \nu(B^-) + \epsilon/3,$$

Let us also assume that $A_n^{\pm} := \Pi_n^{-1}(B^{\pm})$, with $\mu-$zero frontier such that there exists n_2 that forall $n \geq n_2$ $A_n^+ \supset A \supset A_n^-$ and

$$\mu(A_n^+) - \epsilon/3 < \mu(A) < \mu(A_n^-) + \epsilon/3,$$

hold.

Such sets exist by the C^0-convergence of (strong stable/center-unstable) foliations for f_n to the respective foliations for f.

On the one hand, $\exists n_1 \geq n_2$ such that

$$\mu(A) - \mu_n(A) \leq \mu(A) - \mu_n(A) \leq \mu(A) - \mu_n(A_n^-) = \nu(B) - \nu_n(B^-) \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{3},$$

for all $n \geq n_1$, as $\nu_n(B^-) \to \nu(B^-)$ by the statistical stability for g proved in [CV13].

In the same manner, we prove the other inequality, implying there exists $n_0 \geq n_1$ such that

$$|\mu(A) - \mu_n(A)| < \epsilon, \forall n \geq n_0.$$

The same arguments also are valid for the case $k > 0$.

This finishes the lemma.

□

Theorem 5.2. *Given $\varphi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ a continuous function, then $\int_M \varphi d\mu_n \to \int_M \varphi d\mu$.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ given, and the $\delta > 0$ we obtain by the uniform continuity of φ associated to $\epsilon/9$. Take a covering $\cup_{j=1}^k C_j$, $C_j \in \mathcal{C}$ de Λ, with diameter less then $\delta/3$. There is also n_0 such that $\cup_{j=1}^k C_j \supset \Lambda_n$, $\forall n \geq n_0$. In particular, $\mu_n(M \setminus \cup_{j=1}^k C_j) = 0$, $\forall n \geq n_0$.

Consider a partition of unity $\{\psi_j, j = 1, \ldots, k\}$ associated to $\cup_{j=1}^k C_j$.
For each C_j, take $x_j \in C_j$ and set $\hat{\varphi} := \sum_{j=1}^k \varphi(x_j)\psi_j$.
Therefore, $\|\varphi - \hat{\varphi}\|_\infty < \epsilon/3$.
Now, take $n_1 \geq n_0$ such that

$$|(\mu_n - \mu)(C_j)| < \frac{\epsilon}{3k\|\varphi\|_\infty}, \forall n \geq n_1.$$

So, we conclude that

$$\left|\int_M \varphi d\mu_n - \int_M \varphi d\mu\right| \leq \left|\int_M \varphi d\mu_n - \int_M \hat{\varphi} d\mu_n\right| + \left|\int_M \hat{\varphi} d\mu_n - \int_M \hat{\varphi} d\mu\right| + \left|\int_M \varphi d\mu - \int_M \hat{\varphi} d\mu\right|$$

$$\leq \|\varphi - \hat{\varphi}\|_\infty + \sum_{j=1}^k \|\varphi\|_\infty |\mu_n(C_j) - \mu(C_j)| + \|\varphi - \hat{\varphi}\|_\infty < \epsilon, \forall n \geq n_0.$$

□

6. Cones and Projective Metrics

We recall here some necessary results in Projective Metrics defined in Cones whose proofs can be found in [Li95,Ba00,Vi95].

Given a linear space E we say that $C \subset E \backslash \{0\}$ is a convex cone if

$$t > 0 \text{ and } v \in C \Rightarrow t \cdot v \in C.$$

and

$$t_1, t_2 > 0 \text{ and } v_1, v_2 \in C \Rightarrow t_1 \cdot v_1 + t_2 \cdot v_2 \in C.$$

We define $\overline{C}$ to be the set of points $w \in E$ such that there exists $v \in C$ and a sequence of positive numbers $(t_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, going to zero, such that $w + t_n \cdot v \in C$ forall $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We will only consider the so called *projective cones*, such that

$$\overline{C} \cap \left(-\overline{C}\right) = \{0\}.$$

We then define

$$\alpha_C(v, w) = \sup\{t > 0; w - t \cdot v \in C\}$$

and

$$\beta_C(v, w) = \inf\{s > 0; s \cdot v - w \in C\}.$$

We convention $\sup \emptyset = 0$ and $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. The projective metrics associated to C is given by

$$\theta(v, w) = \log \frac{\beta_C(v, w)}{\alpha_C(v, w)}.$$

Indeed,

Proposition 6.1. *Given a projective cone C then $\theta(\cdot, \cdot) : \overline{C} \times \overline{C} \to [0, +\infty]$ is a metrics in the projective space of C, that is,*

- $\theta(v, w) = \theta(w, v)$.
- $\theta(u, w) \leq \theta(u, v) + \theta(v, w)$.
- $\theta(v, w) = 0$ *iff there exists* $t > 0$ *such that* $v = t \cdot w$.

The proof of the following essential result can be found in [Vi97, Proposition 2.3].

Theorem 6.2. *Let E_1 and E_2 be linear spaces and let $C_1 \subset E_1$ and $C_2 \subset E_2$ be projective cones. If $L : E_1 \to E_2$ is a linear operador such that $L(C_1) \subset C_2$ and*

$$D = \sup \{\theta_2(L(v), L(w)); v, w \in C_1\} < \infty$$

then

$$\theta_2(L(v), L(w)) \leq \left(1 - e^{-D}\right) \theta_1(v, w),$$

for all $v, w \in C_1$.

7. Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius Operator and Invariant Cones

We recall that the main goal of this work is to deduce good statistical properties of the maximal entropy probability measure associated to the dynamics f. The technique presented use the Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius operator(for simplicity called transfer operator) and its duality with the Koopman operator, $U(\varphi) = \varphi \circ f$, to obtain the exponential decay of correlations and consequently the central limit theorem.

However, this technique may also be useful to prove exponential decay of correlations and consequently the central limit theorem for more general equilibrium states, not just particularly for measures of maximum entropy. We recall that given a map $f : \Lambda \to \Lambda$, and a fixed potential $\phi : \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}$, we say that a measure η is an equilibrium state for f with respect to ϕ if

$$h_\eta(f) + \int \phi d\eta = \sup \left\{ h_\mu(f) + \int \phi d\mu; \mu \text{ is an } f\text{-invariant probability} \right\}.$$

That is, the variational principle tells us that η carries out the topological pressure $P(f, \phi)$. The reader can easily see that in the case where the potential ϕ is a constant, obtain an equilibrium state is equivalent to obtain a maximum entropy measure. What we do in this section is to obtain some preliminar results, for more general potentials than constant potentials, namely, low variation potentials. That is, we assume that $\sup \phi - \inf \phi < \varepsilon$ for some small enough ε. Moreover such potential must belong to the following cone:

$$\left|e^\phi\right|_\alpha \leq \varepsilon \inf e^\phi \tag{7.1}$$

where $\left|e^\phi\right|_\alpha = \inf \left\{C > 0; |e^\phi(x) - e^\phi(y)| \leq C d(x, y)^\alpha, \forall x, y \in \Lambda\right\}$. Let E be the space of continuous functions $\varphi : \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}$. Define the Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius operator $\mathcal{L} : E \to E$ given

$$\mathcal{L}(\varphi)(y) = \varphi(f^{-1}(y)) e^{\phi(f^{-1}(y))}$$

where ϕ satisfies the above conditions.

Our inspiration is the work developed in [CV13], where the exponential decay of correlations and other good statistical and regularity properties are proven for the unique equilibrium state in a nonuniformly expanding context. Castro-Varandas defined suitable cones for the Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius (or transfer) operator$\mathcal{L}$, proving the invariance and the finite diameter for the image of such cones by $\mathcal{L}$.

More precisely, the basic cone used by [CV13] is the cone of Hölder continuous, positive functions φ such that $|\varphi|_\alpha \leq \kappa \inf \varphi$. The invariance of such cone by f is due some increase in the regularity given by the contraction of some inverse branch of f. In our context, however, we always have backward expansion in stable directions for the points into each strong stable manifold $\Pi^{-1}(y)$ instead of contraction. Since for the case of entropy (potential $\phi \equiv 0$) the transfer operator $\mathcal{L}$, is just the composition



FIGURE 1. Mass distribution

of each observable φ with f^{-1}, it is obvious that the Hölder constants of $\mathcal{L}(\varphi)$, can not better, if one take a cone as in [CV13].

In order to avoid this undesirable effect in stable directions, we will analyse the action of $\mathcal{L}$ in some kind of averages taken in each stable leaf restricted to the attractor Λ. We will write the lowercase letter γ to denote a stable leaf (instersected with Λ) and $\mathcal{F}^s$ will denote the stable foliation.

Fixed $y \in N$, let y_j such that $g(y_j) = y$, where $j \in \{1, \cdots, deg(g)\}$. Writing $\gamma = \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(y)$ and $\gamma_j = \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(y_j)$, it follows that $f(\gamma_j) \subset \gamma$, since $\Pi \circ f(x) = g \circ \Pi(x) = g(y_j) = y$, $\forall x \in \gamma_j$.

Let $\mathbf{p}$ be the degree of g. Let us construct a family of measures $\{\mu_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s}$ supported in Λ, such that for all $\hat{\gamma}$, where $f^n(\hat{\gamma}) \subset \gamma$, we have $\mu_\gamma\left(f^n(\hat{\gamma})\right) = \dfrac{1}{p^n}$. In particular $\mu_\gamma(\gamma) = 1$. Furthermore, for all γ_j, with $f(\gamma_j) \subset \gamma$ we will obtain

$$\int_{f(\gamma_j)} \psi d\mu_\gamma = \frac{1}{p} \int_{\gamma_j} \psi \circ f d\mu_{\gamma_j}.$$

The construction of such family of measures is rather natural. Fix $\gamma = \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(y)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n > 0$. By setting $\gamma_j := \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(y_j)$, where $y_j \in g^{-n}(y)$, one can write $\gamma = \dot{\bigcup}_{j=1}^{p^n} f^n(\gamma_j)$, since f^n is a bijection in Λ and $\Pi \circ f^n = g^n \circ \Pi$. Therefore, $\{f^n(\gamma_j)\}_{j=1}^{p^n}$ is a sequence of partitions in γ. As $\gamma_j = \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(y_j)$ and $f^n : M_{y_j} \to M_{g^n(y_j)}$ is a λ_s^n-contraction it follows that the diameter of $\{f^n(\gamma_j)\}_{j=1}^{p^n}$ goes to zero. So, we just define μ_γ in the elements of such partition by mass distribution

$$\mu_\gamma(f^n(\gamma_j)) = \frac{1}{p^n}$$

and extend μ_γ by approximation to any Borelian $A \subset \Lambda$.

If $\gamma_j = \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(x_j)$, $x_j \in g^{-1}(x)$, then

$$\mu_\gamma(A) = \mu_\gamma(A \cap \gamma) = \mu_\gamma\left(A \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^{p} f(\gamma_j)\right) = \mu_\gamma\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{p} (A \cap f(\gamma_j))\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \mu_\gamma(A \cap f(\gamma_j))$$

Seting $\mu_{\gamma_j}(A) := p \cdot \mu_\gamma(f(A \cap \gamma_j))$ we obtain $\mu_\gamma(A \cap f(\gamma_j)) = \dfrac{1}{p}\mu_{\gamma_j}(f^{-1}(A))$ and so

$$\mu_\gamma(A) = \frac{1}{p}\sum_{j=1}^{p} \mu_{\gamma_j}(f^{-1}(A)).$$

We conclude that for any measurable set A, its indicator function χ_A satisfies

$$\int_{f(\gamma_j)} \chi_A d\mu_\gamma = \frac{1}{p}\int_{\gamma_j} \chi_A \circ f d\mu_{\gamma_j}$$

By Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem, for any $g : \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}$ continuous we have

$$\int_{f(\gamma_j)} g d\mu_\gamma = \frac{1}{p}\int_{\gamma_j} g \circ f d\mu_{\gamma_j}. \tag{7.2}$$

Note also that for all $\hat{\gamma}$, $f^n(\hat{\gamma}) \subset \gamma$, we have $\mu_\gamma(f^n(\hat{\gamma})) = \dfrac{1}{p^n}$. So it follows that for all $\widetilde{\gamma}$ such that $f^n(\widetilde{\gamma}) \subset \gamma_j$ and $f(\gamma_j) \subset \gamma$

$$\mu_{\gamma_j}(f^n(\widetilde{\gamma})) = p\mu_\gamma(f(f^n(\widetilde{\gamma}) \cap \gamma_j)) = p\mu_\gamma\left(f^{n+1}(\widetilde{\gamma})\right) = \frac{p}{p^{n+1}} = \frac{1}{p^n}$$

holds.

That is, μ_{γ_j} is the mass distribution measure constructed for γ_j.

Moreover, for $y \in N$ and y_j such that $g(y_j) = y$, $j \in \{1, \cdots, p\}$ if we consider $\gamma = \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(y)$ and $\gamma_j = \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(y_j)$, $f(\gamma_j) \subset \gamma$, then $\gamma = \dot{\bigcup}_{j=1}^{p} f(\gamma_j)$. Therefore, for all measurable bounded function $\psi : \gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ it follows that

$$\int_\gamma \psi d\mu_\gamma = \sum_{j=1}^{p}\int_{f(\gamma_j)} \psi d\mu_\gamma.$$

For $\rho : \gamma \to \mathbb{R}$, we conclude that

$$\int_\gamma \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\rho d\mu_\gamma = \sum_{j=1}^{p}\int_{f(\gamma_j)} \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\rho d\mu_\gamma = \sum_{j=1}^{p}\frac{1}{p}\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi \cdot e^\phi \cdot \rho \circ f d\mu_{\gamma_j}$$

defining $\rho_j := \dfrac{1}{p}\rho \circ f e^\phi$, we have

$$\int_\gamma \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\rho d\mu_\gamma = \sum_{j=1}^{p}\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}.$$

We will study the action of the transfer operator in the strong stable leaves via its action on the integrals of densities in a suitable cones of functions which are defined in each strong stable leaf. More precisely, for each $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s$ we define the auxiliary cone of Hölder continuous functions

$$\mathcal{D}(\gamma, \kappa) := \{\rho : \gamma \to \rho > 0 \text{ and } |\rho|_\alpha < \kappa \inf \rho\},$$

with $|\rho|_\alpha = \inf\{C > 0; |\rho(x) - \rho(y)| \leq Cd(x, y)^\alpha, \forall x, y \in \gamma\}$.

Note that for ρ in a cone $\mathcal{D}(\gamma, \kappa)$ we have $\sup \rho \leq \inf \rho\,(1 + \kappa \cdot diam M^\alpha)$.

The next lemma is about the invariance of the auxiliary cones under the action of the transfer operator.

Lemma 7.1. *There exist sufficiently small $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $\kappa > 0$, such that the following itens hold:*

(1) *If* $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma,\kappa)$ *then* $\rho_j \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma_j,\lambda\kappa)$ *for all* $j \in \{1,\dots,p\}$.

(2) *For all* $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$, *if* $\rho,\hat{\rho} \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma,\lambda\kappa)$ *then* $\theta(\rho,\hat{\rho}) \leq 2\log\left(\dfrac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)$.

(3) *If* $\rho^{'},\rho^{''} \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma,\kappa)$ *then there exists* $\Lambda_1 = 1-\left(\dfrac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right)^2$ *such that* $\theta_j(\rho^{'}_j,\rho^{''}_j) \leq \Lambda_1\theta(\rho^{'},\rho^{''})$ *for all* $j \in \{1,\dots,p\}$;

where θ_j *and* θ *are the projective metrics associated to* $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_j,\kappa)$ *and* $\mathcal{D}(\gamma,\kappa)$, *respectively.*

Proof. (1) In our context we suppose $\sup\phi - \inf\phi < \varepsilon$ and $\left|e^{\phi}\right|_{\alpha} < \varepsilon \inf e^{\phi}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|\rho_j|_\alpha}{\inf\{\rho_j\}} &= \frac{\left|\frac{1}{p}\rho\circ f\cdot e^{\phi}\right|_\alpha}{\inf\left\{\frac{1}{p}\rho\circ f\cdot e^{\phi}\right\}} = \frac{|\rho\circ f\cdot e^{\phi}|_\alpha}{\inf\{\rho\circ f\cdot e^{\phi}\}} \\
&\leq \frac{|\rho\circ f|_\alpha\cdot e^{\sup\phi}+\sup\{\rho\circ f\}\cdot|e^{\phi}|_\alpha}{\inf\rho\cdot e^{\inf\phi}} \\
&\leq \frac{\lambda_s^\alpha\kappa\inf\rho\cdot e^{\sup\phi}}{\inf\rho\cdot e^{\inf\phi}} + \frac{(1+\kappa\cdot diamM^\alpha)\inf\rho\cdot|e^{\phi}|_\alpha}{\inf\rho\cdot e^{\inf\phi}} \\
&\leq \lambda_s^\alpha\kappa e^{\varepsilon}+(1+\kappa\cdot diamM^\alpha)\varepsilon = (\lambda_s^\alpha e^{\varepsilon}+diamM^\alpha\epsilon)\kappa+\varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

In order to guarantee a $0<\lambda<1$ such that

$$(\lambda_s^\alpha e^{\varepsilon}+diamM^\alpha\varepsilon)\kappa+\varepsilon<\lambda\kappa$$

it is sufficient to obtain

$$\frac{(\lambda_s^\alpha e^{\varepsilon}+diamM^\alpha\varepsilon)\kappa+\varepsilon}{\kappa}<\lambda<1.$$

For that we just need

$$\frac{(\lambda_s^\alpha e^{\varepsilon}+diamM^\alpha\varepsilon)\kappa+\varepsilon}{\kappa}<1$$

or, equivalently,

$$\kappa > \frac{\varepsilon}{1-(\lambda_s^\alpha e^{\varepsilon}+diamM^\alpha\varepsilon)}. \tag{7.3}$$

Note that λ and κ can be chosen in order to satisfy the above equation since we choose in our hipothesis $\varepsilon>0$ and $0<\lambda_s<1$ suitably small.

(2) By a triangular argument, it is sufficient to bound $\theta(1,\rho)$ for $\rho\in\mathcal{D}(\gamma,\lambda\kappa)$. There is no loss of generality in assuming that $\inf\rho=1$. So, for $t=1-\lambda$ we have

$$\frac{|\rho-t|_\alpha}{\inf(\rho-t)} = \frac{|\rho|_\alpha}{\inf\rho-t} < \frac{\lambda\kappa}{1-t} = \frac{\lambda\kappa}{\lambda} = \kappa.$$

Since $\inf\rho=1$ it follows that $\rho-t\geq\inf\rho-(1-\lambda)=\lambda>0$ which guarantees $\alpha(1,\rho)\geq 1-\lambda$. On the other hand, by setting $s=1+\lambda$ we obtain

$$\frac{|s-\rho|_\alpha}{\inf(s-\rho)} = \frac{|\rho|_\alpha}{s-\inf\rho} < \frac{\lambda\kappa}{s-1} = \frac{\lambda\kappa}{\lambda} = \kappa.$$

As $\sup\rho\leq\inf\rho(1+\kappa diamM^\alpha)=1+\kappa diamM^\alpha$ taking κ such that $\lambda>\kappa diamM^\alpha$, it follows that $s-\rho=1+\lambda-\rho\geq 1+\lambda-\sup\rho\geq 1+\lambda-(1+\kappa diamM^\alpha)>0$. Therefore $\beta(1,\rho)\leq 1+\lambda$. So we conclude that $\theta(\rho,\hat{\rho})\leq 2\log\left(\dfrac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)$.

Finally, in order to prove (3) it is sufficient to note that by item (1) we have $\rho_j \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma_j, \lambda\kappa)$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and by item (2) the diameter $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_j, \lambda\kappa)$ in $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_j, \kappa)$ is, at most, $2\log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)$. Therefore, the result goes on by theorem 6.2, considering $\Delta = 2\log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)$ and the linear map

$$\rho \mapsto \frac{1}{p}\rho \circ f e^{\phi}$$

we have $\theta_j(\rho_j^{'}, \rho_j^{''}) \leq \Lambda_1 \theta(\rho^{'}, \rho^{''})$ where

$$\Lambda_1 = 1 - e^{-\Delta} = 1 - \left(\frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right)^2$$

□

For the definition of the main cone on which we will apply the transfer operator we need to define a notion of distance between two strong stable leaves γ and $\widetilde{\gamma}$ in $\mathcal{F}^s$. Given $x, y \in N$ let $\gamma = \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(x)$ and $\widetilde{\gamma} = \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(y)$. Suppose $\pi = \pi_{x,y} : \widetilde{\gamma} \to \gamma$ satisfies

$$\int_\gamma \varphi d\mu_\gamma = \int_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \varphi \circ \pi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}}$$

for all continuous function φ and define the distance $d(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma}) = \sup\{d(\pi(p), p); p \in \widetilde{\gamma}\}$.

Now let us define our main cone. Denote by $\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$ the set of densities $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma, \kappa)$ such that $\int_\gamma \rho d\mu_\gamma = 1$. Given $b > 0$, $c > 0$ and κ as in lemma 7.1, let $C(b, c, \alpha)$ be the cone of functions $\varphi \in E$ satisfying for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s$ the following:

(A): For all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma, \kappa)$:

$$\int_\gamma \varphi \rho d\mu_\gamma > 0$$

(B): For all $\rho^{'}, \rho^{''} \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$:

$$\left|\int_\gamma \varphi\rho^{'} d\mu_\gamma - \int_\gamma \varphi\rho^{''} d\mu_\gamma\right| < b\theta\left(\rho^{'}, \rho^{''}\right) \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)} \left\{\int_\gamma \varphi\rho d\mu_\gamma\right\}$$

(C): Given any $\widetilde{\gamma}$ sufficiently close to γ:

$$\left|\int_\gamma \varphi d\mu_\gamma - \int_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \varphi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}}\right| < cd(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma})^\alpha \inf_\gamma \left\{\int_\gamma \varphi d\mu_\gamma\right\}$$

The proof of the next Lemma follows from standard arguments.

Lemma 7.2. *$C(b, c, \alpha)$ is a projective cone.*

Now, we have:

Proposition 7.3. *Let ϕ be constant. There exists $0 < \sigma < 1$ such that $\mathcal{L}(C(b, c, \alpha)) \subset C(\sigma b, \sigma c, \alpha)$ for sufficiently large b,c > 0.*

Proof. Invariance of condition (A): Let $\varphi \in C(b,c,\alpha)$. We know that $\int_\gamma \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\rho d\mu_\gamma = \sum_{j=1}^{p}\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}$ and by lemma 7.1 $\rho_j \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma_j,\kappa)$. Therefore, $\int_\gamma \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\rho d\mu_\gamma > 0$.

Invariance of condition (B): Denoting $\dfrac{\rho_j}{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}$ by $\hat{\rho}_j$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_\gamma \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\rho d\mu_\gamma\right\} &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{p}\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}\\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{p}\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\hat{\rho}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}\\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{p}\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma_j)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\rho d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

Given $\rho',\rho'' \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$ writing $\rho'_j/\int_{\gamma_j}\rho'_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}$ and $\rho''_j/\int_{\gamma_j}\rho''_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}$ for $\overline{\rho}_j$ and $\overline{\overline{\rho}}_j$, respectively, follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_\gamma \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\rho' d\mu_\gamma - \int_\gamma \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\rho'' d\mu_\gamma\right| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{p}\left|\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\overline{\rho}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j} - \int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\overline{\overline{\rho}}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right|\int_{\gamma_j}\rho'_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^{p}\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\overline{\overline{\rho}}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\left|\int_{\gamma_j}\rho'_j d\mu_{\gamma_j} - \int_{\gamma_j}\rho''_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right|.\end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

By hypothesis, φ is in the cone and by lemma 7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\overline{\rho}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j} - \int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\overline{\overline{\rho}}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right| &\leq b\theta_j\left(\overline{\rho}_j,\overline{\overline{\rho}}_j\right)\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma_j)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\rho d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}\\ &\leq b\Lambda_1\theta\left(\rho',\rho''\right)\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma_j)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\rho d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

For all $\hat{\rho}\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$ we obtain the following estimative

$$\frac{\int_{\gamma_j}(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}} \leq (1+\kappa diam M^\alpha)^2 \tag{7.6}$$

In fact, given $\delta > 0$ there exists $\widetilde{\rho}\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$ such that $\int_{\gamma_j}(\widetilde{\rho})_j d\mu_{\gamma_j} \leq (1+\delta)\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}$. Moreover, as $\hat{\rho}$ and $\widetilde{\rho}$ are normalized, we necessarily have

$\inf\hat{\rho}\leq 1$ and $\sup\widetilde{\rho}\geq 1$. Therefore,

$$\frac{(\hat{\rho})_j}{(\widetilde{\rho})_j}=\frac{\frac{1}{p}\hat{\rho}\circ fe^{\phi}}{\frac{1}{p}\widetilde{\rho}\circ fe^{\phi}}\leq\frac{\sup\hat{\rho}}{\inf\widetilde{\rho}}\leq\frac{(1+\kappa diamM^{\alpha})\inf\hat{\rho}}{(1+\kappa diamM^{\alpha})^{-1}\sup\widetilde{\rho}}=(1+\kappa diamM^{\alpha})^2\,.$$

And so $\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j}(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\leq(1+\kappa diamM^{\alpha})^2\int_{\gamma_j}(\widetilde{\rho})_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}$, we obtain for all $\delta>0$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j}(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\displaystyle\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}}&\leq\frac{(1+\delta)(1+\kappa diamM^{\alpha})^2\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j}(\widetilde{\rho})_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j}(\widetilde{\rho})_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}\\&\leq(1+\delta)(1+\kappa diamM^{\alpha})^2\end{aligned}$$

giving the estimative we wish.

Now, for fixed j, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\left|\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\overline{\rho}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}-\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\overline{\overline{\rho}}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right|\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j^{'}d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\displaystyle\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma_j)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\rho d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}\theta(\rho^{'},\rho^{''})}&\leq\frac{b\Lambda_1\theta(\rho^{'},\rho^{''})\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j^{'}d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\displaystyle\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}\theta(\rho^{'},\rho^{''})}\\&\leq(1+\kappa diamM^{\alpha})^2\Lambda_1 b\end{aligned}\tag{7.7}$$

Let us analyse the second parcel of 7.4. First, note that for all $\hat{\rho}\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$, denoting $(\hat{\rho})_j/\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j}(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}$ by $\bar{\hat{\rho}}_j$, we claim that

$$\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\bar{\hat{\rho}}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\displaystyle\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\overline{\rho}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}}<b\log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)^2+1$$

In fact, analogously to what was done in 7.6, it is sufficient to to note that, since φ is in the cone, we have

$$\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\bar{\hat{\rho}}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\overline{\rho}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}<b\theta(\bar{\hat{\rho}}_j,\overline{\rho}_j)+1=b\theta((\hat{\rho})_j,\rho_j)+1$$

By 7.1, we conclude the proof of our claim.

Now, we stablish the other necessary estimative:

$$\frac{\left|\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j^{'}d\mu_{\gamma_j}-\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j^{''}d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right|}{\theta(\rho^{'},\rho^{''})\displaystyle\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\right\}}\leq 2(1+\kappa diamM^{\alpha})^2\,.$$

In order to prove this last estimative we observe that

$$\frac{\rho_j^{'}}{\rho_j^{''}} \leq \frac{\sup \rho^{'}}{\inf \rho^{''}} \leq \frac{\sup \rho^{'} / \inf \rho^{'}}{\inf \rho^{''} / \sup \rho^{''}} = e^{\theta_+(\rho^{'},\rho^{''})} \leq e^{\theta(\rho^{'},\rho^{''})}$$

Therefore, by assuming without loss of generality that $\int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j^{'} d\mu_{\gamma_j} \geq \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j^{''} d\mu_{\gamma_j}$ we obtain

$$\frac{\left| \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j^{'} d\mu_{\gamma_j} - \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j^{''} d\mu_{\gamma_j} \right|}{\theta\left(\rho^{'}, \rho^{''}\right) \inf\limits_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)} \left\{ \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j} \right\}} \leq \frac{\left(e^{\theta\left(\rho^{'}, \rho^{''}\right)} - 1 \right) \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j^{''} d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\theta\left(\rho^{'}, \rho^{''}\right) \inf\limits_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)} \left\{ \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j} \right\}}$$

for $\theta\left(\rho^{'}, \rho^{''}\right) \leq 1$ it follows $\dfrac{e^{\theta\left(\rho^{'}, \rho^{''}\right)} - 1}{\theta\left(\rho^{'}, \rho^{''}\right)} < 2$ and so we obtain our estimative.

If $\theta\left(\rho^{'}, \rho^{''}\right) \geq 1$ we also have that

$$\frac{\left| \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j^{'} d\mu_{\gamma_j} - \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j^{''} d\mu_{\gamma_j} \right|}{\theta\left(\rho^{'}, \rho^{''}\right) \inf\limits_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)} \left\{ \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j} \right\}} \leq \frac{\left| \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j^{'} d\mu_{\gamma_j} - \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j^{''} d\mu_{\gamma_j} \right|}{\inf\limits_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)} \left\{ \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j} \right\}}$$

$$\leq 2\left(1 + \kappa diam M^{\alpha}\right)^2$$

and again for fixed j and by writing $M(\kappa, \alpha)$ for $\left(1 + \kappa diam M^{\alpha}\right)^2$,

$$\frac{\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi \overline{\overline{\rho}}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j} \left| \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j^{'} d\mu_{\gamma_j} - \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j^{''} d\mu_{\gamma_j} \right|}{\inf\limits_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)} \left\{ \int_{\gamma_j} \varphi \rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j} \right\} \inf\limits_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)} \left\{ \int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j} \right\} \theta(\rho^{'}, \rho^{''})} \leq \quad \frac{\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi \overline{\overline{\rho}}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\inf\limits_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)} \left\{ \int_{\gamma_j} \varphi \rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j} \right\}} 2M(\kappa, \alpha)$$

$$\leq \left(b \log \left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda} \right)^2 + 1 \right) 2M(\kappa, \alpha) \leq \quad 2M(\kappa, \alpha) \log \left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda} \right)^2 b + 2M(\kappa, \alpha) \tag{7.8}$$

The inequalities 7.7 and 7.8 does not depend on j, so

$$\frac{\left| \int_{\gamma} \mathcal{L}(\varphi) \rho^{'} d\mu_{\gamma} - \int_{\gamma} \mathcal{L}(\varphi) \rho^{''} d\mu_{\gamma} \right|}{\inf\limits_{\rho \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)} \left\{ \int_{\gamma} \mathcal{L}(\varphi) \rho d\mu_{\gamma} \right\} \theta(\rho^{'}, \rho^{''})} \quad \leq \quad M(\kappa, \alpha) \Lambda_1 b + 2M(\kappa, \alpha) \log \left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda} \right)^2 b + 2M(\kappa, \alpha)$$

$$= \quad \left(\Lambda_1 + 2 \log \left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda} \right)^2 \right) M(\kappa, \alpha) b + 2M(\kappa, \alpha)$$

We need that the term which multiplies b above to be less than 1. Recall that by lemma (7.1), $\Lambda_1 = 1 - \left(\frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right)^2$. So, we need to guarantee that

$$\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right)^2 + 2\log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)^2\right)(1+\kappa diam M^\alpha)^2 < 1$$

Also by lemma (7.1), we can choose κ, such that $\kappa diam M^\alpha < \lambda$, λ to be fixed. So let us find a bound $0 < \lambda < 1$ such that

$$\left(1 - \left(\frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right)^2 + 2\log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)^2\right)(1+\lambda)^2 < 1.$$

It is possible because (7.1), $0 < \lambda < 1$ can be taken sufficiently small depending on the contraction rate in the strong stable directions. So, there exists $0 < \tilde{\sigma}_1 < 1$ such that

$$\left(\Lambda_1 + 2\log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)^2\right) M(\kappa,\alpha) < \tilde{\sigma}_1.$$

Since $M(\kappa,\alpha)$ does not depend on b, for sufficiently large b we can obtain $\sigma_1 < 1$ such that

$$\frac{\left|\int_\gamma \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\rho' d\mu_\gamma - \int_\gamma \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\rho'' d\mu_\gamma\right|}{\inf\limits_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_\gamma \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\rho d\mu_\gamma\right\}\theta(\rho',\rho'')} \leq \sigma_1 b$$

This prove the strict invariance of condition (B).

Invariance of condition (C): This is where we need that ϕ is constant. We have that

$$\inf_\gamma\left\{\int_\gamma \mathcal{L}\varphi d\mu_\gamma\right\} \geq e^\phi \inf_\gamma\left\{\int_\gamma \varphi d\mu_\gamma\right\}.$$

For g as in 2.1, every $y \in N$ has at least one pre-image out of the region Ω. So, for $\gamma = \Pi^{-1}(y)$ and $\widetilde{\gamma} = \Pi^{-1}(\tilde{y})$ sufficiently close to γ such that $\tilde{y}_i$ is pre-image $\tilde{y}$, close to y_i, stay in U_{y_i} we obtain that $d(\gamma_i,\widetilde{\gamma}_i) \leq \lambda_u d(\gamma,\widetilde{\gamma})$.

In fact, let $x \in \widetilde{\gamma}_i$ realizing the distance $d(\gamma_i,\widetilde{\gamma}_i)$. By a slight abuse of notation, we write d for the product distance equivalent to the original metrics. So,

$$\begin{aligned} d(\gamma_i,\widetilde{\gamma}_i) &= d(x,\pi_{\tilde{y}_i,y_i}(x)) = d(\tilde{y}_i,y_i) \leq \lambda_u d(g(\tilde{y}_i),g(y_i)) \\ &= \lambda_u d(\tilde{y},y) = \lambda_u\left[d(\tilde{y},y) + d(\pi_{\tilde{y},y}(f(x)),\pi_{\tilde{y},y}(f(x)))\right] \\ &= \lambda_u d(f(x),\pi_{\tilde{y},y}(f(x))) \leq \lambda_u d(\widetilde{\gamma},\gamma) \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, in the other cases we have $d(\gamma_j,\widetilde{\gamma}_j) \leq L d(\gamma,\widetilde{\gamma})$. Furthermore, we can assume with no loss of generality, that $d(\gamma_1,\widetilde{\gamma}_1) \leq \tilde{\lambda}_u d(\gamma,\widetilde{\gamma})$, and for other pre-images we have $d(\gamma_j,\widetilde{\gamma}_j) \leq \tilde{L} d(\gamma,\widetilde{\gamma})$. Note that condition C could not hold for such other pre-images with the same c, since they are more distant than the initial leaves $\gamma,\widetilde{\gamma}$. However, just as in Lemma 3.5 of [CV13], It holds with constant

$c(1+(\tilde{L}-1)^{\alpha})$ instead of c. For It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{\gamma}\mathcal{L}\varphi d\mu_{\gamma}-\int_{\widetilde{\gamma}}\mathcal{L}\varphi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}}\right| &\leq \frac{e^{\phi}}{p}\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left|\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi d\mu_{\gamma_j}-\int_{\widetilde{\gamma}_j}\varphi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}_j}\right| \\ &\leq \frac{e^{\phi}c}{p}\inf_{\gamma}\left\{\int_{\gamma}\varphi d\mu_{\gamma}\right\}\sum_{j=1}^{p}d(\gamma_j,\widetilde{\gamma}_j)^{\alpha} \\ &\leq \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_u^{\alpha}+(p-1)(1+(\tilde{L}-1)^{\alpha})\tilde{L}^{\alpha}}{p}cd(\gamma,\widetilde{\gamma})^{\alpha}\inf_{\gamma}\left\{\int_{\gamma}\mathcal{L}\varphi d\mu_{\gamma}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

We should obtain $\dfrac{\tilde{\lambda}_u^{\alpha}+(p-1)(1+(\tilde{L}-1)^{\alpha})\tilde{L}^{\alpha}}{p}<1$. This is equivalent to $(1+(\tilde{L}-1)^{\alpha})\tilde{L}^{\alpha}<\dfrac{p-\tilde{\lambda}_u^{\alpha}}{p-1}$. Due to the fact that $\tilde{L}\geq 1$, we have $\dfrac{p-\tilde{\lambda}_u^{\alpha}}{p-1}\geq 1$, because $\tilde{\lambda}_u<1$. Therefore, there exists $0<\sigma_2<1$ such that

$$\left|\int_{\gamma}\mathcal{L}\varphi d\mu_{\gamma}-\int_{\widetilde{\gamma}}\mathcal{L}\varphi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}}\right|<\sigma_2 cd(\gamma,\widetilde{\gamma})^{\alpha}\inf_{\gamma}\left\{\int_{\gamma}\mathcal{L}\varphi d\mu_{\gamma}\right\} \tag{7.9}$$

which proves (C).

By setting $\sigma=\max\{\sigma_1,\sigma_2\}$, we finish the proof of the proposition. □

8. Finite Diameter of the Main Cone

From now on, up to the end of our text, ϕ will be always constant. In this section, we prove the strict invariance of the main cone $C(b,c,\alpha)$ by the Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius operator $\mathcal{L}$. First, let us calculate the projective metrics Θ. Recall that $\alpha_C(\varphi,\psi)=\sup\{t>0;\psi-t\varphi\in C(b,c,\alpha)\}$. By (A), for all $\gamma\in\mathcal{F}_{loc}^{s}$ and $\rho\in\mathcal{D}(\gamma)$ we have $\displaystyle\int_{\gamma}(\psi-t\varphi)\rho d\mu_{\gamma}>0$, that is, $t<\dfrac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma}\psi\rho d\mu_{\gamma}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma}\varphi\rho d\mu_{\gamma}}$. By condition (B), one obtains

$$\left|\int_{\gamma}(\psi-t\varphi)\rho' d\mu_{\gamma}-\int_{\gamma}(\psi-t\varphi)\rho'' d\mu_{\gamma}\right|<b\theta(\rho',\rho'')\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_{\gamma}(\psi-t\varphi)\rho d\mu_{\gamma}\right\}$$

and so, for all ρ',ρ'', and $\hat{\rho}$ in $\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$ we have

$$t<\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma}\psi\rho' d\mu_{\gamma}-\int_{\gamma}\psi\rho'' d\mu_{\gamma}+b\theta(\rho',\rho'')\int_{\gamma}\psi\hat{\rho}d\mu_{\gamma}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma}\varphi\rho' d\mu_{\gamma}-\int_{\gamma}\varphi\rho'' d\mu_{\gamma}+b\theta(\rho',\rho'')\int_{\gamma}\varphi\hat{\rho}d\mu_{\gamma}}$$

and

$$t<\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma}\psi\rho'' d\mu_{\gamma}-\int_{\gamma}\psi\rho' d\mu_{\gamma}+b\theta(\rho',\rho'')\int_{\gamma}\psi\hat{\rho}d\mu_{\gamma}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma}\varphi\rho'' d\mu_{\gamma}-\int_{\gamma}\varphi\rho' d\mu_{\gamma}+b\theta(\rho',\rho'')\int_{\gamma}\varphi\hat{\rho}d\mu_{\gamma}}.$$

By condition (C),

$$\left|\int_{\gamma}(\psi-t\varphi)d\mu_{\gamma}-\int_{\widetilde{\gamma}}(\psi-t\varphi)d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}}\right|<cd(\gamma,\widetilde{\gamma})^{\alpha}\inf_{\gamma}\left\{\int_{\gamma}(\psi-t\varphi)\,d\mu_{\gamma}\right\}$$

therefore, for all $\gamma, \hat{\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$ and $\widetilde{\gamma}$ sufficiently close to γ we have

$$t < \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \psi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}} - \int_{\gamma} \psi d\mu_{\gamma} + cd(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma}) \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \psi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}}{\displaystyle\int_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \varphi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}} - \int_{\gamma} \varphi d\mu_{\gamma} + cd(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma}) \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}}$$

and

$$t < \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \psi d\mu_{\gamma} - \int_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \psi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}} + cd(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma}) \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \psi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \varphi d\mu_{\gamma} - \int_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \varphi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}} + cd(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma}) \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}}.$$

By defining

$$\xi(\gamma, \rho', \rho'', \hat{\rho}, \varphi, \psi) = \frac{\left(\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \psi \rho'' d\mu_{\gamma} - \int_{\gamma} \psi \rho' d\mu_{\gamma}\right) / \int_{\gamma} \psi \hat{\rho} d\mu_{\gamma} + b\theta(\rho', \rho'')}{\left(\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \varphi \rho'' d\mu_{\gamma} - \int_{\gamma} \varphi \rho' d\mu_{\gamma}\right) / \int_{\gamma} \varphi \hat{\rho} d\mu_{\gamma} + b\theta(\rho', \rho'')}$$

and

$$\eta(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma}, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{\rho}, \varphi, \psi) = \frac{\left(\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \psi d\mu_{\gamma} - \int_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \psi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}}\right) / \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \psi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}} + cd(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma})}{\left(\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \varphi d\mu_{\gamma} - \int_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \varphi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}}\right) / \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}} + cd(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma})}.$$

we can write

$$\alpha_C(\varphi, \psi) = \inf \left\{ \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \psi \rho d\mu_{\gamma}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \varphi \rho d\mu_{\gamma}}, \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \psi \hat{\rho} d\mu_{\gamma}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \varphi \hat{\rho} d\mu_{\gamma}} \xi(\gamma, \rho', \rho'', \hat{\rho}, \varphi, \psi), \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \psi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}}{\displaystyle\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}} \eta(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma}, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{\rho}, \varphi, \psi) \right\}$$

as $\beta_C(\varphi, \psi) = \alpha_C(\psi, \varphi)^{-1}$ we obtain

$$\beta_C(\varphi, \psi) = \sup \left\{ \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \varphi \rho d\mu_{\gamma}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \psi \rho d\mu_{\gamma}}, \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \varphi \hat{\rho} d\mu_{\gamma}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \psi \hat{\rho} d\mu_{\gamma}} \xi(\gamma, \rho', \rho'', \hat{\rho}, \psi, \varphi), \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}}{\displaystyle\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \psi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}} \eta(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma}, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{\rho}, \psi, \varphi) \right\}$$

Now, we prove that the Θ-diameter of $\mathcal{L}(C(b, c, \alpha))$ is finite.

Proposition 8.1. *For all sufficiently large $b > 0$, $c > 0$ and for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ we have*

$$\Delta := \sup \{\Theta(\mathcal{L}\varphi, \mathcal{L}\psi); \varphi, \psi \in C(b, c, \alpha)\} < \infty.$$

Proof. Given $\varphi, \psi \in C(\sigma b, \sigma c, \alpha)$, note that

$$\frac{1 - \sigma}{1 + \sigma} < \xi(\gamma, \rho', \rho'', \hat{\rho}, \psi, \varphi) < \frac{1 + \sigma}{1 - \sigma}$$

and

$$\frac{1 - \sigma}{1 + \sigma} < \eta(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma}, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{\rho}, \psi, \varphi) < \frac{1 + \sigma}{1 - \sigma}$$

Indeed, given $\rho^{'}, \rho^{''}, \hat{\rho} \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$

$$\frac{\int_\gamma \varphi\rho^{''}d\mu_\gamma - \int_\gamma \varphi\rho^{'}d\mu_\gamma}{\int_\gamma \varphi\hat{\rho}d\mu_\gamma} \leq \frac{\sigma b\theta(\rho^{'},\rho^{''}) \inf\limits_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_\gamma \varphi\rho d\mu_\gamma\right\}}{\int_\gamma \varphi\hat{\rho}d\mu_\gamma} \leq \sigma b\theta(\rho^{'},\rho^{''})$$

and

$$\frac{\int_\gamma \varphi\rho^{''}d\mu_\gamma - \int_\gamma \varphi\rho^{'}d\mu_\gamma}{\int_\gamma \varphi\hat{\rho}d\mu_\gamma} \geq \frac{-\sigma b\theta(\rho^{'},\rho^{''}) \inf\limits_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)}\left\{\int_\gamma \varphi\rho d\mu_\gamma\right\}}{\int_\gamma \varphi\hat{\rho}d\mu_\gamma} \geq -\sigma b\theta(\rho^{'},\rho^{''})$$

holds.

The same is valid for ψ and as $\sigma < 1$ we conclude that

$$\frac{1-\sigma}{1+\sigma} < \frac{\left(\int_\gamma \psi\rho^{''}d\mu_\gamma - \int_\gamma \psi\rho^{'}d\mu_\gamma\right) / \int_\gamma \psi\hat{\rho}d\mu_\gamma + b\theta(\rho^{'},\rho^{''})}{\left(\int_\gamma \varphi\rho^{''}d\mu_\gamma - \int_\gamma \varphi\rho^{'}d\mu_\gamma\right) / \int_\gamma \varphi\hat{\rho}d\mu_\gamma + b\theta(\rho^{'},\rho^{''})} < \frac{1+\sigma}{1-\sigma}$$

That is,

$$\frac{1-\sigma}{1+\sigma} < \xi(\gamma,\rho^{'},\rho^{''},\hat{\rho},\psi,\varphi) < \frac{1+\sigma}{1-\sigma}.$$

In a similar way, we prove that

$$\frac{1-\sigma}{1+\sigma} < \eta(\gamma,\widetilde{\gamma},\hat{\gamma},\hat{\rho},\psi,\varphi) < \frac{1+\sigma}{1-\sigma}$$

Denoting by Θ_+ the projective metrics associated to the cone defined just by condition (A),

$$\Theta_+(\varphi,\psi) = \log \sup_{\gamma,\rho\in\mathcal{D}(\gamma),\hat{\gamma},\hat{\rho}\in\mathcal{D}(\hat{\gamma})} \left\{\frac{\int_\gamma \varphi\rho d\mu_\gamma \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \psi\hat{\rho}d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}}{\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \varphi\hat{\rho}d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}} \int_\gamma \psi\rho d\mu_\gamma}\right\}$$

it followd by the expression of Θ that

$$\Theta(\varphi,\psi) < \Theta_+(\varphi,\psi) + \log\left(\frac{1+\sigma}{1-\sigma}\right)^2.$$

So, we just need to prove that the Θ_+-diameter of $\mathcal{L}(C(b,c,\alpha))$ is finite. By a triangular argument, it is sufficient to show that $\{\Theta_+(\mathcal{L}\varphi,1);\varphi \in C(b,c,\alpha)\}$ is finite. For that, we just need to find an upper bound for $\dfrac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \mathcal{L}\varphi\hat{\rho}d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}}{\int_\gamma \mathcal{L}\varphi\rho d\mu_\gamma}$ for all $\varphi \in C(b,c,\alpha)$, $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$ and $\hat{\rho} \in \mathcal{D}_1(\hat{\gamma})$. First, note that

$$\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \mathcal{L}\varphi\hat{\rho}d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}}{\int_\gamma \mathcal{L}\varphi\rho d\mu_\gamma} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{p}\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\sum_{j=1}^{p}\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}$$

and we reduce our problem to bound

$$\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}\varphi(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} = \frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}\varphi(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}\varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}\varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi d\mu_{\gamma_j}}\frac{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}$$

Denoting $\dfrac{\rho_j}{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}$ and $\dfrac{(\hat{\rho})_j}{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}$ by $\overline{\rho}_j$ and $\overline{\overline{\rho}}_j$, respectively, applying (B) and lemma 7.1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}\varphi(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}\varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}} &= \frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}\varphi\overline{\overline{\rho}}_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}\varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}} \leq \left(1+b\theta_j\left(\overline{\overline{\rho}}_j,1\right)\right)\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \\ &\leq \left(1+b\log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)\right)\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \qquad (8.1)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} = \frac{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j}\varphi\overline{\rho}_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} \leq \frac{\left(1+b\theta_j\left(1,\overline{\rho}_j\right)\right)}{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} \leq \frac{\left(1+b\log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)\right)}{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}$$

We know that $(\hat{\rho})_j = \dfrac{1}{p}\hat{\rho}\circ f\cdot e^{\phi}$ and $\rho_j = \dfrac{1}{p}\rho\circ f\cdot e^{\phi}$. Since ρ and $\hat{\rho}$ are normalized, it follows that $(\hat{\rho})_j \leq \dfrac{1}{p}(1+\kappa diam(M)^{\alpha})e^{\phi}$ and $\rho_j \geq \dfrac{1}{p}(1+\kappa diam(M)^{\alpha})^{-1}e^{\phi}$. Therefore

$$\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} < (1+\kappa diam(M)^{\alpha})^2\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}e^{\phi}d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j}e^{\phi}d\mu_{\gamma_j}},$$

On the other hand, $\left|e^{\phi}\right|_{\alpha} < \varepsilon\inf e^{\phi}$ and so $\sup e^{\phi} < (1+\varepsilon diam(M)^{\alpha})\inf e^{\phi}$. We then obtain $\dfrac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}e^{\phi}d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j}e^{\phi}d\mu_{\gamma_j}} < 1+\varepsilon diam(M)^{\alpha}$ and by consequence

$$\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j}(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j}\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} < (1+\kappa diam(M)^{\alpha})^2(1+\varepsilon diam(M)^{\alpha}).$$

Moreover for γ e $\hat{\gamma}$ such that we can apply (C) we have

$$\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi d\mu_{\gamma_j}} \leq 1 + cd\left(\hat{\gamma}_j, \gamma_j\right)^{\alpha} \leq 1 + c.diam(M)^{\alpha}$$

implying that

$$\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi \rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} < \left(1 + b \log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)\right)^2 (1 + \max\{\kappa, c, \varepsilon\} diam(M)^{\alpha})^4,$$

finishing the proof of the proposition. □

9. Exponential Decay of Correlations

In this section, we prove the Exponential Decay of Correlation for Hölder continuous observables.

In our context, the transfer operator is just $\mathcal{L}(\varphi) = \varphi \circ f^{-1}$ acting in the space of continuous observables.

The adjoint operador of $\mathcal{L}$ is

$$\int \tilde{\mathcal{L}} \varphi d\mu = \int \varphi d\mathcal{L}^* \mu.$$

for all continuous φ and all probability measure μ. Instead of the nonuniformly expanding case, any invariant probability is an eigenmeasure of the transfer operator's adjoint:

Proposition 9.1. *If f is invertible, then $\mathcal{L}^*(\mu) = \mu$ if and only if μ is f-invariant.*

Proof. Let φ be a continuous function. If $\mathcal{L}^*(\mu) = \mu$ then

$$\int \varphi \circ f^{-1} d\mu = \int \mathcal{L}(\varphi) d\mu = \int \varphi d\mathcal{L}^*(\mu) = \int \varphi d\mu,$$

Now, givem an f-invariant measure μ, we have

$$\int \varphi d\mathcal{L}^*(\mu) = \int \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\varphi) d\mu = \int \varphi \circ f^{-1} d\mu = \int \varphi d\mu$$

□

Other important relation obtained from the f-invariance of a measure μ is that

$$\int (\varphi \circ f^n) \psi d\mu = \int \varphi \mathcal{L}^n(\psi) d\mu \tag{9.1}$$

Indeed, as $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\varphi) = \varphi \circ f^{-1}$ we have

$$\int (\varphi \circ f) \psi d\mu = \int \varphi \circ f \circ f^{-1} \psi \circ f^{-1} d\mu = \int \varphi \mathcal{L}(\psi) d\mu$$

and by induction,

$$\int (\varphi \circ f^n) \psi d\mu = \int \varphi \mathcal{L}^n(\psi) d\mu.$$

The exponential decay of correlations of the maximizing entropy measure will be a consequence of the strict invariance of the Main Cone that we proved in the last section, and the following

Lemma 9.2. *For all $\varphi \in C^{\alpha}(M)$ there exists $K(\varphi) > 0$ such that $\varphi + K(\varphi) \in C(b, c, \alpha)$.*

Proof. First we prove that there exists $K_3 = K_3(\varphi) > 0$ such that $\varphi + K_3$ satisfies the condition (C) in the definition of cone $C(b, c, \alpha)$. The projections between stable leaves guarantees that

$$\int_{\gamma} \varphi d\mu_{\gamma} = \int_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \varphi \circ \pi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}}$$

Given $\varphi \in C^{\alpha}(M)$ we have

$$\frac{\varphi(x) - \varphi(\pi(x))}{d(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma})} \leq \frac{\varphi(x) - \varphi(\pi(x))}{d(\pi(x), x)} \leq |\varphi|_{\alpha}$$

So

$$\sup_{\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma}} \left\{ \frac{\left| \int_{\gamma} \varphi d\mu_{\gamma} - \int_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \varphi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \right|}{d(\gamma, \widetilde{\gamma})} \right\} \leq |\varphi|_{\alpha} < \infty$$

On the other hand, for $K > 0$, all we have $\inf_{\gamma} \left\{ \int_{\gamma} (\varphi + K) \, d\mu_{\gamma} \right\} = \inf_{\gamma} \left\{ \int_{\gamma} \varphi d\mu_{\gamma} \right\} + K$. It is sufficient to choose $K_3 = K_3(\varphi) > 0$ such that

$$c \inf_{\gamma} \left\{ \int_{\gamma} (\varphi + K_3) \, d\mu_{\gamma} \right\} > |\varphi|_{\alpha}$$

In order to see that there exists $K_2 = K_2(\varphi)$ such that $\varphi + K_2$ satisfies the condition (B), just note that

$$\sup_{\rho', \rho'' \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)} \left\{ \frac{\left| \int_{\gamma} \varphi \rho' d\mu_{\gamma} - \int_{\gamma} \varphi \rho'' d\mu_{\gamma} \right|}{\theta(\rho', \rho'')} \right\} < \infty.$$

Indeed, as $\rho', \rho'' \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$ we have $\frac{\rho'}{\rho''} \leq e^{\theta(\rho', \rho'')}$ and so, for all bounded φ

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\gamma} \varphi \rho' d\mu_{\gamma} - \int_{\gamma} \varphi \rho'' d\mu_{\gamma} \right| = & \left| \int_{\gamma} \left(\frac{\rho'}{\rho''} - 1 \right) \varphi \rho'' d\mu_{\gamma} \right| \leq \int_{\gamma} \left| \frac{\rho'}{\rho''} - 1 \right| |\varphi| \, \rho'' d\mu_{\gamma} \\ \leq & \sup \left| \frac{\rho'}{\rho''} - 1 \right| \sup \varphi \sup \rho'' = \left| \sup \frac{\rho'}{\rho''} - 1 \right| \sup \varphi \sup \rho'' \\ \leq & \left| e^{\theta(\rho', \rho'')} - 1 \right| \sup \varphi \sup \rho'' \end{aligned}$$

Let B such that $\sup(\varphi + B) = 1$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\left| \int_{\gamma} \varphi \rho' d\mu_{\gamma} - \int_{\gamma} \varphi \rho'' d\mu_{\gamma} \right|}{\theta(\rho', \rho'')} &= \frac{\left| \int_{\gamma} (\varphi + B) \rho' d\mu_{\gamma} - \int_{\gamma} (\varphi + B) \rho'' d\mu_{\gamma} \right|}{\theta(\rho', \rho'')} \\ &\leq \frac{\left(e^{\theta(\rho', \rho'')} - 1 \right) \sup \rho''}{\theta(\rho', \rho'')}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\theta(\rho', \rho'') < 1$ then $\dfrac{e^{\theta(\rho',\rho'')} - 1}{\theta(\rho', \rho'')} < 2$ and as $\rho'' \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$ we have

$$\frac{\left|\int_\gamma \varphi\rho' d\mu_\gamma - \int_\gamma \varphi\rho'' d\mu_\gamma\right|}{\theta(\rho', \rho'')} \leq 2(1 + \kappa diam(M)^\alpha)$$

Now, if $\theta(\rho', \rho'') \geq 1$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\left|\int_\gamma \varphi\rho' d\mu_\gamma - \int_\gamma \varphi\rho'' d\mu_\gamma\right|}{\theta(\rho', \rho'')} &\leq \left|\int_\gamma (\varphi + B)\rho' d\mu_\gamma - \int_\gamma (\varphi + B)\rho'' d\mu_\gamma\right| \\ &\leq \int_\gamma |(\varphi + B)(\rho' - \rho'')| \, d\mu_\gamma \\ &\leq \sup(\varphi + B)(\sup\rho' + \sup\rho'') \leq 2(1 + \kappa diam(M)^\alpha)\end{aligned}$$

and this implies

$$\sup_{\rho',\rho''\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)} \left\{ \frac{\left|\int_\gamma \varphi\rho' d\mu_\gamma - \int_\gamma \varphi\rho'' d\mu_\gamma\right|}{\theta(\rho', \rho'')} \right\} < \infty.$$

The choice of $K_2 = K_2(\varphi)$ is similar of what we have done for (C). On condition (A) , since φ is continuous with compact domain, there exists $K_1 = K_1(\varphi)$ such that $\varphi + K_1 > 0$ and so $\int_\gamma (\varphi + K_1)\rho d\mu_\gamma > 0$, $\forall\gamma \in F^s_{loc}$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma)$. We complete the proof by taking $K(\varphi) = \max\{K_1, K_2, K_3\}$.

□

Now, denote by $\mu_\gamma \times \nu$ the measure given by

$$\mu_\gamma \times \nu(\varphi) := \int\int_\gamma \varphi d\mu_\gamma d\nu(\gamma).$$

By unicity of the maximal entropy probability measure, we notice that $\mu = \mu_\gamma \times \nu$, where ν is the maximal entropy probability measure for g. Indeed, let us first show that $\mu_\gamma \times \nu$ is an f-invariant probability. In fact, for all $x \in M$, given $\gamma = \Pi^{-1}_\Lambda(x)$ and $\gamma_j = \Pi^{-1}_\Lambda(x_j)$, with $f(\gamma_j) \subset \gamma$ and $g(x_j) = x$ we have $\mu_\gamma(A) = \dfrac{1}{p}\sum_{j=1}^{p} \mu_{\gamma_j}\left(f^{-1}(A)\right)$. By Castro-Varandas[CV13], ν is an eigenmeasure of the adjoint $\mathcal{L}^*_{g,\phi}$ given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{g,\phi}(\varphi)(x) := \sum_{g(x_j)=x} e^{\phi(x_j)}\varphi(x_j),$$

for constant potential ϕ. More precisely, if r is the spectral radius of $\mathcal{L}^*_{g,\phi}$, which is equal to the degree of g, then $\mathcal{L}^*_{g,\phi}(\nu) = r\nu$. By normalizing $\mathcal{L}^*_{g,\phi}$ by $r = p$, we obtain for any continuous ϕ

$$\int \varphi(x)d\nu = \frac{1}{r}\int \varphi(x)d\mathcal{L}^*_{g,\phi}\nu = \frac{1}{r}\int \mathcal{L}_{g,\phi}(\varphi)(x)d\nu = \int \frac{1}{p}\sum_{j=1}^{p}\varphi(x_j)d\nu.$$

Therefore, for $A \in \mathcal{A}_0$ we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}(\mu_\gamma \times \nu)(f^{-1}(A)) &= \mu_\gamma \times \nu(\chi_{f^{-1}(A)}) = \int\int_\gamma \chi_{f^{-1}(A)} d\mu_\gamma d\nu \\ &= \int \mu_\gamma\left(f^{-1}(A)\right) d\nu = \int \frac{1}{p}\sum_{j=1}^{p} \mu_{\gamma_j}\left(f^{-1}(A)\right) d\nu \\ &= \int \mu_\gamma(A) d\nu = \int\int_\gamma \chi_A d\mu_\gamma d\nu = \mu_\gamma \times \nu(A)\end{aligned}$$

As we have shown in previous sections, this implies the same equality for any borelian A.

Furthermore $\mu_\gamma \times \nu(A) = \mu(A)$. Indeed, let $A = \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(A_N)$, with $A_N \in \mathcal{A}_N$.

On the one hand, we have that

$$\mu(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(A_N)) = \nu\left(\Pi_\Lambda\left(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(A_N)\right)\right) = \nu\left(A_N\right) = \int_N \chi_{A_N} d\nu$$

and on the other hand,

$$\mu_\gamma \times \nu\left(\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(A_N)\right) = \int\int_\gamma \chi_{\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(A_N)} d\mu_\gamma d\nu$$

As $\chi_{\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(A_N)}(x) = \chi_{A_N}(\Pi_\Lambda(x))$ and for all γ there exists $x_0 \in N$ such that $\gamma = \Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(x_0)$. So

$$\int_\gamma \chi_{\Pi_\Lambda^{-1}(A_N)}(x) d\mu_\gamma = \int_\gamma \chi_{A_N}(\Pi_\Lambda(x)) d\mu_\gamma = \int_\gamma \chi_{A_N}(x_0) d\mu_\gamma = \chi_{A_N}(x_0)$$

and then, $\mu_\gamma \times \nu(A) = \mu(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_0$. Now, given $A \in \mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_n$, as $\mathcal{A}_n = f^n(\mathcal{A}_0)$, we have that there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}_0$ such that $A = f^n(A_0)$. Therefore

$$\mu_\gamma \times \nu(A) = \mu_\gamma \times \nu(f^n(A_0)) = \mu_\gamma \times \nu(A_0).$$

Since μ is f-invariant, $\mu(A) = \mu(f^n(A_0)) = \mu(A_0)$, we conclude that $\mu = \mu_\gamma \times \nu$.

Theorem B. *The measure μ has exponential decay of de correlations for Hölder continuous observables.*

Proof. We should prove that for α-Hölder observables φ, ψ , there exist $0 < \tau < 1$ and $K(\varphi, \psi) > 0$ such that

$$\left| \int (\varphi \circ f^n)\psi d\mu - \int \varphi d\mu \int \psi d\mu \right| \leq K(\varphi, \psi) \cdot \tau^n, \forall n \geq 1.$$

By (9.1) this is equivalent to prove

$$\left| \int \varphi \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi)\, d\mu - \int \varphi d\mu \int \psi d\mu \right| \leq K(\varphi, \psi) \cdot \tau^n, \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1.$$

We start with the case $\varphi_{|\gamma} \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma)$, $\forall \gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$ and $\psi \in C(b, c, \alpha)$. We also assume $\int \varphi d\mu \neq 0$ and $\int \psi d\mu = 1$.

Recall that $\mathcal{L}(1) = 1 \circ f = 1$. Since $\varphi_{|\gamma} \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma)$ for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$ by (A) we have

$$\frac{\int_\gamma \varphi \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi) d\mu_\gamma}{\int_\gamma \varphi d\mu_\gamma} \leq \beta_+\left(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi), 1\right)$$

Since ψ is normalized we have $\int \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi)d\mu = \int \psi d\mu = 1$. As $\mu = \mu_\gamma \times \nu$

$$\int \left(\int_\gamma \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi) d\mu_\gamma \right) d\nu = \int \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi) d\mu = 1$$

and so there exists $\hat{\gamma}$ such that $\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi) d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}} \leq 1$. We conclude that

$$\alpha_+ \left(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi), 1 \right) \leq \frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi) d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}}{\int_{\hat{\gamma}} d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}} = \int_{\hat{\gamma}} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi) d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}} \leq 1$$

and for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$

$$\frac{\int_\gamma \varphi \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi) d\mu_\gamma}{\int_\gamma \varphi d\mu_\gamma} \leq \frac{\beta_+ \left(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi), 1 \right)}{\alpha_+ \left(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi), 1 \right)} \leq e^{\Theta_+ \left(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi), 1 \right)} \leq e^{\Theta \left(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi), 1 \right)}.$$

By proposition 7.3 and by proposition 8.1, since the cone $C(\sigma b, \sigma c, \alpha)$ has Θ-diameter less or equal than Δ, it follows from proposition 6.2 that $\exists\, 0 < \tau < 1$ such that $\forall \varphi, \psi \in C(b, c, \alpha)$ we have $\Theta(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\varphi), \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi)) \leq \Delta \tau^{n-1}$. In consequence,

$$\frac{\int \varphi \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi) d\mu}{\int \varphi d\mu} = \frac{\int \int_\gamma \varphi \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi) d\mu_\gamma d\nu}{\int \int_\gamma \varphi d\mu_\gamma d\nu} \leq e^{\Theta \left(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi), 1 \right)} \leq e^{\Delta \tau^{n-1}}.$$

Note now that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{e^{\Delta \tau^{n-1}} - 1}{\tau^n} = \frac{\Delta}{\tau}$. So, there exists $\tilde{\Delta} > 0$ such that $e^{\Delta \tau^{n-1}} - 1 < \tilde{\Delta} \tau^n$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies that

$$\left| \int \varphi d\mu \right| \left| \frac{\int \varphi \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi) d\mu}{\int \varphi d\mu} - 1 \right| \leq \left| \int \varphi d\mu \right| \left(e^{\Delta \tau^{n-1}} - 1 \right) \leq \left| \int \varphi d\mu \right| \tilde{\Delta} \tau^n$$

If $\int \psi d\mu \neq 1$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int \varphi \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi) d\mu - \int \varphi d\mu \int \psi d\mu \right| &= \left| \int \psi d\mu \right| \left| \int \varphi \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n \left(\frac{\psi}{\int \psi d\mu} \right) d\mu - \int \varphi d\mu \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int \psi d\mu \right| \left| \int \varphi d\mu \right| \tilde{\Delta} \tau^n \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

By lemma 9.2 given an α-Hölder continuous function ψ, there exists $K(\psi) > 0$, such that $\psi + K(\psi) \in C(b, c, \alpha)$. Therefore $\psi = \psi + K(\psi) - K(\psi)$ and noting that $\int \varphi \mathcal{L}^n(K(\psi)) d\mu = \int \varphi d\mu \int K(\psi) d\mu$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int \varphi \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi) d\mu - \int \varphi d\mu \int \psi d\mu \right| &= \left| \int \varphi \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi + K(\psi)) d\mu - \int \varphi d\mu \int (\psi + K(\psi)) d\mu \right| \\ &\leq \left(\left| \int \psi d\mu \right| + K(\psi) \right) \left| \int \varphi d\mu \right| \tilde{\Delta} \tau^n \end{aligned}$$

Now, given an α-Hölder φ, note that there exists $K(\varphi) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\varphi_{|\gamma} + K(\varphi) + B \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma)$ for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$ and $\int \varphi + K(\varphi) + B d\mu > 0$, for all $B > 0$. Indeed,

$$\left|\varphi_{|\gamma} + K(\varphi)\right|_\alpha < \kappa \inf\left\{\varphi_{|\gamma} + K(\varphi)\right\}$$

if, and only if,

$$K(\varphi) > \frac{\left|\varphi_{|\gamma}\right|_\alpha}{\kappa} - \inf\left\{\varphi_{|\gamma}\right\}$$

Set $K(\varphi) = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}} \left\{ \left| \frac{\left|\varphi_{|\gamma}\right|_\alpha}{\kappa} \right| \right\} - \inf \varphi$. Observe that $K(\varphi) \leq \frac{|\varphi|_\alpha}{\kappa} - \inf \varphi < \infty$. As $\varphi_{|\gamma} + K(\varphi) \geq \frac{\left|\varphi_{|\gamma}\right|_\alpha}{\kappa} \geq 0$ for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$, it follows that $\varphi_{|\gamma} + K(\varphi) + B \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma)$ and $\int (\varphi + K(\varphi)) d\mu + B > 0$, $\forall B > 0$. Analogously to the last case

$$\left| \int \varphi \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi)\, d\mu - \int \varphi d\mu \int \psi d\mu \right| \leq \left(\left| \int \psi d\mu \right| + K(\psi) \right) \left(\left| \int \varphi d\mu \right| + K(\varphi) + B \right) \tilde{\Delta} \tau^n$$

and since B is any positive number

$$\left| \int \varphi \tilde{\mathcal{L}}^n(\psi)\, d\mu - \int \varphi d\mu \int \psi d\mu \right| \leq \left(\left| \int \psi d\mu \right| + K(\psi) \right) \left(\left| \int \varphi d\mu \right| + K(\varphi) \right) \tilde{\Delta} \tau^n$$

.

Since $\left| \int \varphi d\mu \right| - \inf \varphi \geq 0$, we have $\left| \int \varphi d\mu \right| + K(\varphi) \geq 0$. By taking

$$K(\varphi, \psi) := \left(\left| \int \psi d\mu \right| + K(\psi) \right) \left(\left| \int \varphi d\mu \right| + K(\varphi) \right) \tilde{\Delta},$$

we conclude the proof of the Theorem.

□

10. Central Limit Theorem

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the Borel σ-algebra of M and let $\mathcal{G}_n := f^{-n}(\mathcal{G})$ be a nonincreasing family of σ-algebras. A function $\xi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{G}_n$-measurable if, and only if, $\xi = \xi_n \circ f^n$ for some $\mathcal{G}$- measurable ξ_n. Let $L^2(\mathcal{G}_n) = \{\xi \in L^2(\mu); \xi \text{ is } \mathcal{G}_n\text{-measurable }\}$. Note that $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{G}_{n+1}) \subset \mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{G}_n)$ for each $n \geq 0$. Given $\varphi \in L^2(\mu)$, we will denote by $\mathbb{E}(\varphi|\mathcal{G}_n)$ the L^2-orthogonal projection of φ on $L^2(\mathcal{G}_n)$.

We will apply the following adaption of a result due to Gordin, whose proof can be found in [Vi97]:

Theorem 10.1. *[Gordin.] Let $(M, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ be a probability space, and let $\phi \in L^2(\mu)$ be such that $\int \phi d\mu = 0$. Assume that $f : M \to M$ is an invertible bimeasurable map and that μ is an f-ergodic invariant probability. Let $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_n := f^{-n}(\mathcal{F}_0)$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, is a nonincreasing family of σ-algebras. Define*

$$\sigma^2_\phi := \int \phi^2 d\mu + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \phi \cdot (\phi \circ f^j)\, d\mu.$$

Assume

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbb{E}(\phi|\mathcal{F}_n)\|_2 < \infty \text{ and } \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|\phi - \mathbb{E}(\phi|\mathcal{F}_{-n})\|_2 < \infty.$$

Then $\sigma_\phi < \infty$ and $\sigma_\phi = 0$ if, and only if, $\phi = u \circ f - u$ for some $u \in L^1(\mu)$. Moreover, if $\sigma_\phi > 0$ then for any interval $A \subset \mathbb{R}$

$$\mu\left(x \in M : \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \left(\phi(f^j(x))\right) \in A\right) \to \frac{1}{\sigma_\phi \sqrt{2\pi}} \int_A e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma_\phi^2}} dt,$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Let $\mathcal{F}_0$ the σ-algebra whose elements are Borelian subsets of Λ which are union local stable leaves (intersected with Λ). Not that, if φ F_0-mensurable then φ is constant along local stable leaves.

We start by proving a statement of exponential decay of correlation concerning to function in $L^1(F_0)$.

Proposition 10.2. *Let $\varphi \in L^1(F_0)$ and ψ be a α-Hölder continuous function. Then, there exist constants $0 < \tau < 1$ and $C(\psi) > 0$ such that*

$$\left|\int (\varphi \circ f^n)\psi d\mu - \int \varphi d\mu \int \psi d\mu\right| \leq C(\psi) \int |\varphi| \, d\mu \cdot \tau^n$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

Proof. Since φ is F_0-measurable, it is constant restricted to local stable leaves, so, $|\varphi|_\gamma|_\alpha = 0$, $\forall \gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$. Suppose $\varphi \geq 0$ and let $K(\varphi)$ and $K(\psi)$ as in the proof of Th. B. Therefore

$$K(\varphi) = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}} \left\{ \left| \frac{|\varphi|_\gamma|_\alpha}{\kappa} \right| \right\} - \inf \varphi = -\inf \varphi$$

Since $\left|\int \varphi d\mu\right| - \inf \varphi \leq \int |\varphi| \, d\mu$, just as in the proof of Th. B, it follows that

$$\left|\int (\varphi \circ f^n)\psi d\mu - \int \varphi d\mu \int \psi d\mu\right| \leq \left(\left|\int \psi d\mu\right| + K(\psi)\right) \int |\varphi| \, d\mu \cdot \tau^n.$$

Now, we can write $\varphi = \varphi^+ - \varphi^-$ where $\varphi^\pm = \frac{1}{2}(|\varphi| \pm \varphi)$. Noting that $\int |\varphi^\pm| \, d\mu \leq \int |\varphi| \, d\mu$ from linearity of the integral we obtain

$$\left|\int (\varphi \circ f^n)\psi d\mu - \int \varphi d\mu \int \psi d\mu\right| \leq C(\psi) \int |\varphi| \, d\mu \cdot \tau^n$$

with $C(\psi) := 2\left(\left|\int \psi d\mu\right| + K(\psi)\right)$. □

As a consequence of the proposition we are able to prove:

Lemma 10.3. *For every Hölder continuous function φ with $\int \varphi d\mu = 0$ there is $R = R(\varphi)$ such that $\|\mathbb{E}(\varphi|\mathcal{F}_n)\|_2 \leq R\tau^n$ for all $n \geq 0$.*

Proof. Due to the last proposition, if $\psi \in L^1(F_0)$ and $\int \psi d\mu \leq 1$, then

$$\left|\int (\psi \circ f^n)\varphi d\mu - \int \psi d\mu \int \varphi d\mu\right| \leq C(\varphi) \cdot \tau^n.$$

As $\|\psi\|_1 \leq \|\psi\|_2$ and $\int \varphi d\mu = 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbb{E}(\varphi|\mathcal{F}_n)\|_2 &= \sup\left\{\int \xi\varphi d\mu; \xi \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_n), \|\xi\|_2 = 1\right\} \\ &= \sup\left\{\int (\psi \circ f^n)\,\varphi d\mu; \psi \in L^2(F_0), \|\psi\|_2 = 1\right\} \leq R(\varphi)\,\tau^n\end{aligned}$$

□

Now, we can prove:

Theorem C. ***(Central Limit Theorem)***

Let μ be the maximal entropy probability for $f : \Lambda \to \Lambda$, as in (2.2). Given a Hölder continuous function φ and

$$\sigma_\varphi^2 := \int \phi^2 d\mu + 2\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\int \phi\cdot(\phi\circ f^j)\,d\mu, \qquad \text{with} \qquad \phi = \varphi - \int \varphi\,d\mu.$$

Then $\sigma_\varphi < \infty$ and $\sigma_\varphi = 0$ if, and only if, $\varphi = u \circ f - u$ for some $u \in L^1(\mu)$. Moreover, if $\sigma_\varphi > 0$ then for all interval $A \subset \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mu\left(x \in M : \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}\left(\varphi(f^j(x)) - \int \varphi d\mu\right) \in A\right) = \frac{1}{\sigma_\varphi\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_A e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma_\varphi^2}}\,dt.$$

Proof. By the last lemma, $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\|\mathbb{E}(\phi|\mathcal{F}_n)\|_2 < \infty$, so the first condition for Gordin's Theorem holds. The second condition follows from the Hölder continuity of φ. In fact, $\mathbb{E}(\phi, \mathcal{F}_{-n})$ is constant in each n-image $\eta = f^n(\gamma)$ of a stable leaf γ and

$$\inf(\phi|_\gamma) \leq \mathbb{E}(\phi, \mathcal{F}_{-n}) \leq \sup(\phi|_\gamma).$$

Since the diameter of η is less $C_s\lambda_s^n$ for some constant C_s which does not depend on γ, $\lambda_s \in (0,1)$, and ϕ is (A,α)-Hölder for some constant $A > 0$, we obtain that

$$\|\phi - \mathbb{E}(\phi, \mathcal{F}_{-n})\|_2 \leq \|\phi - \mathbb{E}(\phi, \mathcal{F}_{-n})\|_0 \leq AC_s^\alpha\lambda_s^{\alpha n}.$$

which guarantees $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\|\phi - \mathbb{E}(\phi, \mathcal{F}_{-n})\|_2 < \infty$. The result then follows as a consequence of Gordin's Theorem. □

Remark 10.4. We have seen that the invariance a suitable cone of distributions with respect the transfer operator implied in a rather economic way the exponential decay of correlations and the Central Limit. Once we have such cone, one can define a (basically unique) anisotropic space E associated to such cone. Such space is a Banach space in which the transfer operator exhibits a spectral gap. The procedure to define such space is very simple. Roughly speaking, such cone C defines a order relation $\prec$ in a Banach Lattice B of bounded functions given by

$$v \prec w \Leftrightarrow w - v \in C$$

Let e be some function in B such that for any function φ in B , there exists a constant c_φ such that $-c_\varphi e \prec \varphi \prec c_\varphi e$. For example, in our case, take $e \equiv 1$. Setting $\|\varphi\| := \inf\{c_\phi; -c_\varphi e \prec \varphi \prec c_\varphi e\}$, one easily checks that this is a norm. The anisotropic space is obtained by completing B with respect this norm. This

approach, associated with Lasota Yorke estimates instead of projective cones, was used by Baladi, Gouezel, Liverani, Tsujii, among others, in several works [Bal05, BT07, BG10, BL12] to study fine spectral properties of the transfer operator in hyperbolic contexts.

11. Systems derived from Anosov

In this section we study partially hiperbolic dynamics as in the second setting described in section 2. Recall that such setting contains an open class of derived from Anosov systems. Using the techniques and results in the sections before, we prove again the strict invariance of a suitable cone of functions by the transfer operator. Furthermore, from the convergence of such cone, we construct a measure exhibiting exponential decay of correlations, and satisfying the Central Limit Theorem.

11.1. **Invariant Cones.** Given $x \in \Lambda$ we will denote by γ the intersection of the local (strong) stable manifold x with the Markov rectangle where x belongs in. By the mixing property of the Markov partition, there is no great loss of generality in supposing that for any rectangles R_i and R_j of $\mathcal{R}$ we have

$$f(R_i) \cap R_j \neq \emptyset.$$

Otherwise, one can work with some positive iterate of f. Given $\gamma = W^s_{loc}(x) \cap R_i$, for some fixed Markov rectangle R_i, by the Markovian property we have $\gamma = \bigcup_{j=1}^{p_\gamma} f(\gamma_j)$, for $\gamma_j, j = 1, \dots p_\gamma$ corresponding to strong stable manifolds whose images by f intersect the interior of γ. Observe also that by the Markovian property, all γ in R_i have pre-images in the same rectangles. In particular, p_γ depends only on R_i. This is important for the calculation of the finite diameter of the cone and slightly modifies the definition of the auxiliar probabilities μ_γ on the leaves $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$.

Let $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$, $\gamma = \bigcup_{j=1}^{p_\gamma} f(\gamma_j)$. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$, by induction we can write

$$\gamma = \bigcup_{i_1=1}^{p_{i_0}} \bigcup_{i_2=1}^{p_{i_1}} \cdots \bigcup_{i_n=1}^{p_{i_{n-1}}} f^n(\gamma_{i_1 \cdots i_n})$$

where $f(\gamma_{i_1 \cdots i_{n+1}}) \subset \gamma_{i_1 \cdots i_n}$, $\gamma_{i_1 \cdots i_n} = \bigcup_{i_{n+1}=1}^{p_{i_n}} f(\gamma_{i_1 \cdots i_{n+1}})$ and $p_{i_k}, k \in \mathbb{N}$. Note also that que $p_{i_0} = p_\gamma$. Since the last union is disjoint, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 1$, the sets $f^n(\gamma_{i_1 \cdots i_n})$ with $i_k \in \{1, \cdots, p_{i_{k-1}}\}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \geq 1$ define a partition for γ. So, it is natural to define a probability measure in γ as:

$$\mu_\gamma \left(f^n \left(\gamma_{i_1 \cdots i_n} \right) \right) := \frac{1}{p_{i_0} p_{i_1} \cdots p_{i_{n-1}}}$$

Since $f^n \left(\gamma_{i_1 \cdots i_n} \right)$ we have that μ_γ is a Borelian measure of γ. In fact, It is a probability measure, as

$$\mu_\gamma(\gamma) = \sum_{i_1=1}^{p_{i_0}} \sum_{i_2=1}^{p_{i_1}} \cdots \sum_{i_n=1}^{p_{i_{n-1}}} \mu_\gamma \left(f^n(\gamma_{i_1 \cdots i_n}) \right) = \sum_{i_1=1}^{p_{i_0}} \sum_{i_2=1}^{p_{i_1}} \cdots \sum_{i_n=1}^{p_{i_{n-1}}} \frac{1}{p_{i_0} p_{i_1} \cdots p_{i_{n-1}}} = 1.$$



FIGURE 2. Mass distribution for derived from Anosov systems

Of course, such measure can be seen as a conditional measure on Λ. Let A be a Borelian subset of Λ. So,

$$\mu_\gamma(A) = \mu_\gamma(A \cap \gamma) = \mu_\gamma\left(A \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^{p_\gamma} f(\gamma_j)\right) = \mu_\gamma\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{p_\gamma} (A \cap f(\gamma_j))\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{p_\gamma} \mu_\gamma(A \cap f(\gamma_j))$$

Defining $\mu_{\gamma_j}(A) := p_\gamma \mu_\gamma(f(A \cap \gamma_j))$ we obtain that $\dfrac{1}{p_\gamma}\mu_{\gamma_j}(f^{-1}(A)) = \mu_\gamma(A \cap f(\gamma_j))$ and then

$$\mu_\gamma(A) = \frac{1}{p_\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{p_\gamma} \mu_{\gamma_j}(f^{-1}(A))$$

Moreover, $\mu_{\gamma_j}\left(f^n\left(\gamma_{j_1 \cdots j_n}\right)\right) = \dfrac{1}{p_{j_0} p_{j_1} \cdots p_{j_{n-1}}}$. In particular, it is a probability in γ_j. Note also that $\mu_\gamma(A \cap f(\gamma_j)) = \dfrac{1}{p_\gamma}\mu_{\gamma_j}(f^{-1}(A))$ implies that for any measurable set A, its characteristic function χ_A satisfies

$$\int_{f(\gamma_j)} \chi_A d\mu_\gamma = \frac{1}{p_\gamma} \int_{\gamma_j} \chi_A \circ f d\mu_{\gamma_j}$$

therefore, by the dominated convergence Theorem, for any continuous function $g : \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}$ one concludes that

$$\int_{f(\gamma_j)} g d\mu_\gamma = \frac{1}{p_\gamma} \int_{\gamma_j} g \circ f d\mu_{\gamma_j}. \tag{11.1}$$

Applying the transfer operator $\mathcal{L}(\varphi)(x) = \varphi(f^{-1}(x))e^{\phi(f^{-1}(x))}$ and using 11.1 we obtain

$$\int_\gamma \mathcal{L}(\varphi)\rho d\mu_\gamma = \sum_{j=1}^{p_\gamma} \int_{\gamma_j} \varphi \rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}$$

with $\rho_j := \dfrac{1}{p_\gamma}\rho \circ f e^{\phi}$. We will adapt the same kind of Main Cone previously defined for a diffeomorphism semiconjugated to a Castro-Varandas map.

The main change is in condition (C). The comparison in condition (C) will concern just strong stable leaves in the same rectangle. In the same manner as before we define the cone $\mathcal{D}(\gamma,\kappa)$ of densities $\rho : \gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\rho > 0$ and $|\rho|_\alpha < \kappa \inf \rho$. Lemma 7.1, is still valid, that is, there exists $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $\kappa > 0$ such that

(1) For all $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$ if $\rho, \hat{\rho} \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma, \lambda\kappa)$ then $\theta(\rho,\hat{\rho}) \leq 2\log\left(\dfrac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)$.

(2) If $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma,\kappa)$ then $\rho_j \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma_j, \lambda\kappa)$, $\forall j \in \{1,\ldots,p\}$.

(3) If $\rho', \rho'' \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma,\kappa)$ then there exists $\Lambda_1 = 1 - \left(\dfrac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda}\right)^2$ such that $\theta_j(\rho'_j, \rho''_j) \leq \Lambda_1 \theta(\rho', \rho'')$, $\forall j \in \{1,\ldots,p\}$;

where θ_j and θ are, respectively, the projective metrics of $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_j,\kappa)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\gamma,\kappa)$.

Once more, denote by $\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$ the set of densities $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma,\kappa)$ such that $\displaystyle\int_\gamma \rho d\mu_\gamma = 1$. Given $b > 0$, $c > 0$ and κ as in lemma 7.1, let $C[b,c,\alpha]$ be the cone of functions $\varphi \in E$ satisfying the conditions below for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s$:

- (A) For all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\gamma,\kappa)$:
$$\int_\gamma \varphi\rho d\mu_\gamma > 0$$
- (B) For all $\rho', \rho'' \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$:
$$\left|\int_\gamma \varphi\rho' d\mu_\gamma - \int_\gamma \varphi\rho'' d\mu_\gamma\right| < b\theta(\rho',\rho'') \inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)} \left\{\int_\gamma \varphi\rho d\mu_\gamma\right\}$$
- (C) Given to leaves γ and $\widetilde{\gamma}$ in the same Markov rectangle R_i:
$$\left|\int_\gamma \varphi d\mu_\gamma - \int_{\widetilde{\gamma}} \varphi d\mu_{\widetilde{\gamma}}\right| < cd(\gamma,\widetilde{\gamma})^\alpha \inf_\gamma \left\{\int_\gamma \varphi d\mu_\gamma\right\}$$

Remark 11.1. Given γ and $\widetilde{\gamma}$ in the same rectangle, that is, $\gamma = W^s_{loc}(x) \cap R_i$, $\widetilde{\gamma} = W^s_{loc}(y) \cap R_i$ and $x, y \in int(R_i)$ then $W^s_{loc}(x) \cap f(R_j) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $W^s_{loc}(y) \cap f(R_j) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, there exists $p \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gamma = \displaystyle\bigcup_{j=1}^{p} f(\gamma_j)$ and $\widetilde{\gamma} = \displaystyle\bigcup_{j=1}^{p} f(\hat{\gamma}_j)$, where $\gamma_j, \widetilde{\gamma}_j \subset R_j$ and $p_\gamma = p_{\widetilde{\gamma}} = p$.

Remark 11.2. Let γ and $\widetilde{\gamma}$ in the same Markov rectangle. Assume without loss of generality that γ_1 and $\widetilde{\gamma}_1$ are in the same good rectangle and so there exists $0 < \lambda_{uc} < 1$ such that $d(\gamma_1,\widetilde{\gamma}_1) \leq \lambda_{uc} d(\gamma,\widetilde{\gamma})$ and in the other cases, $j \neq 1$, there exists $\tilde{L} \geq 1$ close to 1 such that $d(\gamma_j,\widetilde{\gamma}_j) \leq \tilde{L} d(\gamma,\widetilde{\gamma})$.

The proof of the next proposition is entirely analogous to Prop. 7.3:

Proposition 11.3. *There exists $0 < \sigma < 1$ such that $\mathcal{L}(C[b,c,\alpha]) \subset C[\sigma b, \sigma c, \alpha]$ for sufficiently big b and c.*

Let Θ denote the projective metrics of $C[b,c,\alpha]$. Now we occupy ourselves with the important

Proposition 11.4. *For all sufficiently big $b > 0$, $c > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ the diameter of $\mathcal{L}(C[b, c, \alpha])$ is finite, that is, there exists $\Delta := \sup \{\Theta(\mathcal{L}\varphi, \mathcal{L}\psi); \varphi, \psi \in C[b, c, \alpha]\} < \infty$.*

Proof. Denote by Θ_+ the projective metrics associated to the cone defined by condition (A).

Exactly as in Proposition 8.1, it follows from the expression of Θ that

$$\Theta(\varphi, \psi) \leq \Theta_+(\varphi, \psi) + \log\left(\frac{1+\sigma}{1-\sigma}\right)^2.$$

In order to prove that the Θ_+-diameter of $\mathcal{L}(C[b, c, \alpha])$ is finite, we just need to upper bound $\Theta_+(\mathcal{L}(\varphi), 1)$ in the cone $C[b, c, \alpha]$. By the definition of Θ_+ this problem reduces to obtain an upper bound to

$$\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \mathcal{L}\varphi\hat{\rho}d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma} \mathcal{L}\varphi\rho d\mu_{\gamma}} = \frac{\displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{p_{\hat{\gamma}}} \int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{p_{\gamma}} \int_{\gamma_j} \varphi\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} \tag{11.2}$$

for $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_1(\gamma)$ and $\hat{\rho} \in \mathcal{D}_1(\hat{\gamma})$. First, we will bound the expression

$$\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} = \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\displaystyle\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi d\mu_{\gamma_j}} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}$$

for γ_j and $\hat{\gamma}_j$ in the same Markov rectangle. This is the same kind of calculations beginning with equation 8.1 in Prop. 8.1. From that, we conclude that

$$\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\displaystyle\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}} \leq \left(1 + b\log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)\right) \int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} (\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}$$

and

$$\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi d\mu_{\gamma_j}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} \leq \frac{\left(1 + b\log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)\right)}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}}.$$

Recall that $(\hat{\rho})_j = \dfrac{1}{p_{\hat{\gamma}}}\hat{\rho}\circ f$ and $\rho_j = \dfrac{1}{p_{\gamma}}\rho\circ f$. Since ρ and $\hat{\rho}$ are normalized densities, if follows that $(\hat{\rho})_j \leq \dfrac{1}{p_{\hat{\gamma}}}(1+\kappa diam(M)^{\alpha})$ and $\rho_j \geq \dfrac{1}{p_{\gamma}}(1+\kappa diam(M)^{\alpha})^{-1}$. Therefore

$$\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} (\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\displaystyle\int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} < \frac{p_{\gamma}}{p_{\hat{\gamma}}}(1 + \kappa diam(M)^{\alpha})^2$$

On the other hand $\left|e^{\phi}\right|_{\alpha} < \varepsilon \inf e^{\phi}$ and so $\sup e^{\phi} < (1+\varepsilon diam(M)^{\alpha}) \inf e^{\phi}$. So we obtain

$$\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} (\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j} \rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} < \frac{p_\gamma}{p_{\hat{\gamma}}}(1+\kappa diam(M)^{\alpha})^2 \quad \leq \quad p_{max}(1+\kappa diam(M)^{\alpha})^2$$

Due to condition (C), the following inequality also holds:

$$\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \varphi d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi d\mu_{\gamma_j}} \leq 1 + cd\left(\hat{\gamma}_j, \gamma_j\right)^{\alpha} \leq 1 + c.diam(M)^{\alpha}$$

Hence

$$\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_j} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_j d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_j}}{\int_{\gamma_j} \varphi\rho_j d\mu_{\gamma_j}} < p_{max}\left(1 + b\log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)\right)^2 (1+\max\{\kappa, c\}diam(M)^{\alpha})^2.$$

However, given a leaf γ there could exist more than one leaf γ_j in the same Markov rectangle. So, we rewrite eq. (11.2) in the following manner:

$$\frac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \mathcal{L}\varphi\hat{\rho} d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}}{\int_{\gamma} \mathcal{L}\varphi\rho d\mu_{\gamma}} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{p}\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\hat{\gamma})} \int_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_{k_l} d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}}}{\sum_{k=1}^{p}\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\gamma)} \int_{\gamma_{k_l}} \varphi\rho_{k_l} d\mu_{\gamma_{k_l}}}$$

such that for $R_k \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $\gamma_{k_l} \subset R_k$ for each $l \in \{1, \cdots, r_k(\gamma)\}$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{k_l} \subset R_k$ for each $l \in \{1, \cdots, r_k(\hat{\gamma})\}$. Moreover $\sum_{k=1}^{p} r_k(\gamma) = p_\gamma$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{p} r_k(\hat{\gamma}) = p_{\hat{\gamma}}$. Since $\gamma_{k_l}, \hat{\gamma}_{k_l} \subset R_k$, by defining

$$\tilde{C} := p_{max}\left(1 + b\log\left(\frac{1+\lambda}{1-\lambda}\right)\right)^2 (1+\max\{\kappa, c\}diam(M)^{\alpha})^2,$$

we have that $\dfrac{\int_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_{k_l} d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}}}{\int_{\gamma_{k_l}} \varphi\rho_{k_l} d\mu_{\gamma_{k_l}}} \leq \tilde{C}$. Now, we are interested in finding an upper bound for $\dfrac{\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\hat{\gamma})} \int_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_{k_l} d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}}}{\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\gamma)} \int_{\gamma_{k_l}} \varphi\rho_{k_l} d\mu_{\gamma_{k_l}}}$. Suppose $r_k(\hat{\gamma}) \leq r_k(\gamma)$. Since the parcels

$\int_{\gamma_{k_l}} \varphi\rho_{k_l} d\mu_{\gamma_{k_l}}$ are positive we can assume $r_k(\hat{\gamma}) = r_k(\gamma)$. Therefore, $\dfrac{\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\hat{\gamma})} \int_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_{k_l} d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}}}{\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\gamma)} \int_{\gamma_{k_l}} \varphi\rho_{k_l} d\mu_{\gamma_{k_l}}} \leq$ $\tilde{C}$. Now, if $r_k(\hat{\gamma}) \geq r_k(\gamma)$, there exist $q = q(\gamma, \hat{\gamma}), r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r_k(\hat{\gamma}) = qr_k(\gamma)+r$, for $0 \leq r < r_k(\gamma)$ and $1 \leq q$. So, we write $l(s)$ for $(s-1)r_k(\gamma) + l$ and obtain

$$\frac{\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\hat{\gamma})} \int_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_{k_l} d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}}}{\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\gamma)} \int_{\gamma_{k_l}} \varphi\rho_{k_l} d\mu_{\gamma_{k_l}}} = \sum_{s=1}^{q} \left(\frac{\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\gamma)} \int_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_{l(s)}}} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_{k_{l(s)}} d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_{l(s)}}}}{\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\gamma)} \int_{\gamma_{k_l}} \varphi\rho_{k_l} d\mu_{\gamma_{k_l}}} \right) + \frac{\sum_{l=qr_k(\gamma)+1}^{r_k(\hat{\gamma})} \int_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_{k_l} d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}}}{\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\gamma)} \int_{\gamma_{k_l}} \varphi\rho_{k_l} d\mu_{\gamma_{k_l}}}$$

Each term in the sum in $s \in \{1, \cdots, q\}$, satisfies the earlier case therefore the first sum can be bounded by $q\tilde{C}$. As $r_k(\hat{\gamma}) - qr_k(\gamma) = r < r_k(\gamma)$, the last parcel also satisfies the first case. In short,

$$\frac{\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\hat{\gamma})} \int_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}} \varphi(\hat{\rho})_{k_l} d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}_{k_l}}}{\sum_{l=1}^{r_k(\gamma)} \int_{\gamma_{k_l}} \varphi\rho_{k_l} d\mu_{\gamma_{k_l}}} \leq (q+1)\tilde{C}.$$

Note that $q = q(\gamma, \hat{\gamma}) \leq p_{max}$, for any γ and $\hat{\gamma}$. Therefore (11.2) is bounded by $(p_{max}+1)\tilde{C}$ and

$$\Delta := \sup \{\Theta(\mathcal{L}\varphi, \mathcal{L}\psi); \varphi, \psi \in C(b, c, \alpha)\} \leq 2(p_{max}+1)\tilde{C}.$$

□

11.2. **Statistical properties.** Now we construct a measure in Λ which is a good candidate for maximal entropy measure. For such probability measure, we prove the exponential decay of correlations for Hölder continuous observables and the Central Limit Theorem.

Up to now, we have obtained an $\mathcal{L}$-invariant cone $C[b, c, \alpha]$ such that $\mathcal{L}(C[b, c, \alpha])$ has finite diameter. This guarantees, in some sense the convergence of functions in the cone $C[\sigma b, \sigma c, \alpha]$.

Let $\hat{\eta}$ be any probability measure in the quotient space of Λ given by $\mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$, and define the measure

$$\eta(\varphi) := \int \left(\int_\gamma \varphi d\mu_\gamma \right) d\hat{\eta}(\gamma) \tag{11.3}$$

For $\varphi \in C[b, c, \alpha]$ let

$$\varphi_n = \frac{\mathcal{L}^n(\varphi)}{\int \mathcal{L}^n(1) d\eta} = \mathcal{L}^n(\varphi),$$

As $\Theta_+(\varphi_m, \varphi_n) \leq \Theta(\varphi_m, \varphi_n)$ it follows that φ_n is a Θ_+-Cauchy sequence. Moreover, observe also that $\Theta_+(\varphi_n, 1) = \Theta_+(\varphi_n, \mathcal{L}^n(1)) \to 0$. In particular

$$\frac{\int_\gamma \varphi_n d\mu_\gamma}{\int_{\hat{\gamma}} \varphi_n d\mu_{\hat{\gamma}}} \to 1, \forall \gamma, \hat{\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}, \text{ uniformly} \tag{11.4}$$

Note that $\int_\gamma \varphi d\mu_\gamma$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$ is bounded from below far from zero, because $\varphi \in C([b, c, \alpha])$, say, by a constant $q > 0$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is positive, this implies that $\int_\gamma \varphi_n d\mu_\gamma \geq \int_\gamma \mathcal{L}^n(q) d\mu_\gamma = q$. We have somewhat more: Suppose that μ is an $f-$invariant probability satisfying a product measure property just as η in equation 11.3. Then, for every n there exist γ_n, $\hat{\gamma}_n$ such that $\int \varphi_n d\gamma_n \geq \int_M \varphi_n d\mu = \int_M \varphi d\mu \geq \int \varphi_n d\hat{\gamma}_n$. Due to equation 11.4, this means (even if η is not invariant) the following limit

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int \varphi_n d\eta = \mu(\varphi).$$

holds.

Let us see that there exists an f-invariant probabilty measure $\mu = \mu_\gamma \times \hat{\mu}$, which will coincide with the last limit, for any probability η satisfying eq.(11.3). Consider in M the following : $x \sim y$ if, and only if, x and y belongs in the same leaf $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$. Let $g : \mathcal{F}^s_{loc} \to \mathcal{F}^s_{loc}$ be the *quotient map* of f defined by $g(\widetilde{x}) = \widetilde{f(x)}$. Take the sigma-algebra generated by the Markov rectangles and its refinements by f^{-1}. It may be that such $\sigma-$algebra does not coincide with the Borel $\sigma-$ algebra in $M/\sim$. However, just as in [Cas02], most of the cylinders in the construction of $\mathcal{R} \vee f^{-1}(\mathcal{R}) \dots$ have arbitrarily small $M/\sim$-diameter. We give the following construction for the measure $\hat{\mu}$. Each rectangle has the same measure, and the sum of it is one. Take a rectangle, say, $R_1 \in \mathcal{R}$. Let $\mathcal{R}_1 := \{R_{1,1}, \dots R_{1,n_1}\}$ be the set of connected intersections of f^{-1} and the several elements of $\mathcal{R}$. Then we set $\hat{\mu}(R_{1,1}) = \cdots = \hat{\mu}(R_{1,n_1}) := 1/n_1$. We continue inductively, taking the pre-images of the elements in $\mathcal{R}_1$, doing the mass distribution. Note that due to the mild mixing property of the Markov Partition, there is $0 < c < 1$ such that the cylinders in each phase of the construction have its $\hat{\mu}-$measure multiplied by a fraction less than c if compared with the cylinders, in the phase before. In particular, if we take a minimal element S in $M/\sim$ with non-zero diameter, its $\hat{\mu}-$measure can be approached by a cylinder with arbitrarily small $\hat{\mu}-$measure. This means that $\hat{\mu}(S) = 0$, and so, $\vee_{n=0}^{\infty} f^{-n}(\mathcal{R})$ is the Borelian $\sigma-$algebra, modulo null-$\hat{\mu}$ sets. Note that (by arguments as in [Cas02]) there are leaves that can be written as enumerable intersections of cylinders. We saturate positively $\hat{\mu}$ to extend it to a measure in M. A simple calculation leads to the fact that

$$\mu = \mu_\gamma \times \hat{\mu},$$

which is invariant by construction.

If one has uniqueness of the maximal entropy measure in the quotient map g defined in the last paragraph, then, one can proceed as in section 4 to conclude that the measure that we just constructed is the maximal entropy measure for the system in the second setting. In the case when the central-unstable direction is one dimensional, such existence and uniqueness of the maximal entropy measure for the

quotient map is guaranteed by the work of Liverani-Saussol-Vaienti [LSV98]. This implies Corollary 2.4.

Now we proceed with the proof of the exponential decay of correlations for μ.

Again, we have:

Proposition 11.5. *If f is invertible then $\mathcal{L}^*(\mu) = \mu$ if and only if μ is f-invariant.*

Therefore, μ is an f-invariant probability.

$$\int (\varphi \circ f^n)\, \psi d\mu = \int \varphi \mathcal{L}^n(\psi) d\mu. \tag{11.5}$$

We also have that any Hölder function can be written as a sum of functions in the cone. That is,

Proposition 11.6. *For all $\varphi \in C^\alpha(M)$ there exists $K(\varphi) > 0$ such that $\varphi + K(\varphi) \in C[b, c, \alpha]$.*

The proof of the proposition above is essentially the same of that of Lemma 9.2.

Now, we are able to prove:

Theorem 11.7 (Exponential decay of correlations for systems in the second setting)**.** *The measure μ exhibits exponential decay of correlations for Hölder continuous observables.*

Proof. The proof is exactly the same of Theorem 9, using the corresponding propositions 11.3 and 11.4 that we have just proved for systems in the second setting. □

The Central Limit Theorem follows again from the exponential decay of correlations and Gordin's Theorem (Th. 10.1).

Acknowledgements. The authors are grateful to C. Liverani and P. Varandas for very fruitful conversations on thermodynamical formalism and to the anonimous referees for the careful reading of the manuscript and suggestions. This work was partially supported by CNPq-Brazil and FAPESB.

References

[ABV00] J. F. Alves, C. Bonatti, M. Viana, *SRB measures for partially hyperbolic systems whose central direction is mostly expanding*, Invent. Math. **140** (2000), 351-398.

[AM06] A. Arbieto and C. Matheus. Fast decay of correlations of equilibrium states of open classes of non-uniformly expanding maps and potentials. Preprint www.preprint.impa.br, 2006.

[Bal00] V. Baladi. *Positive transfer operators and decay of correlations*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., 2000.

[Bal05] V. Baladi, *Anisotropic Sobolev spaces and dynamical transfer operators: C^∞ foliations*, in: Algebraic and Topological Dynamics", Sergiy Kolyada, Yuri Manin & Tom Ward (eds). Contemporary Mathematics, Amer. Math. Society, 123-136 (2005)

[BG10] V. Baladi and S. S. Gouezel. Banach spaces for piecewise cone hyperbolic maps. *J. Modern Dynam.*, 4, 91–137, 2010.

[BL12] V. Baladi and C. Liverani, Exponential decay of correlations for piecewise cone hyperbolic contact flows *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 314, 689-773, (2012).

[BT07] V. Baladi and M. Tsujii, Hölder and Sobolev spaces for hyperbolic diffeomorphisms. *Ann.Inst. Fourier*, 57, 27–54, 2007.

[BKL01] M. Blank and G. Keller and C. Liverani. Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius spectrum for Anosov maps. *Nonlinearity*, 15, 1905–1973, 2001.

[BV00] C. Bonatti and M. Viana. *SRB measures for partially hyperbolic systems whose central direction is mostly contracting*. Israel Journal Math., 1999.

[Bow71] R. Bowen. Entropy for Group Endomorphisms and Homogeneous Spaces. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society,Volume 153, January 1971

[Bow75] R. Bowen. *Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms*, volume 470 of *Lect. Notes in Math.* Springer Verlag, 1975.

[BT08] H. Bruin and M. Todd. Equilibrium states for interval maps: potentials with $\sup \varphi - \inf \varphi < h_{\text{top}}(f)$. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 283:579–611, 2008.

[BMD02] J. Buzzi and V. Maume-Deschamps. Decay of correlations for piecewise invertible maps in higher dimensions. *Israel J. Math.*, 131:203–220, 2002.

[BS03] J. Buzzi and O. Sarig. Uniqueness of equilibrium measures for countable Markov shifts and multidimensional piecewise expanding maps. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.*, 23:1383–1400, 2003.

[BF09] J. Buzzi and T. Fisher. Intrinsic ergodicity for certain nonhyperbolic robustly transitive systems. arXiv:0903.3692

[BF13] J. Buzzi and T. Fisher. Entropic stability beyond partial hyperbolicity. J. Mod. Dyn. 7, No. 4, 527-552 (2013).

[BFSV12] J. Buzzi, T. Fisher, M. Sambarino, C. Vásquez. Maximal entropy measures for certain partially hyperbolic, derived from Anosov systems *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* 32(01):63 - 79 (2012).

[BK98] H. Bruin and G. Keller. Equilibrium states for S-unimodal maps. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.*, 18:765–789, 1998.

[Car93] M. Carvalho. Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen measures for N-dimensional derived from Anosov diffeomorphisms. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.*, 13: 21–44, (1993)

[Cas98] Backward inducing and exponential decay of correlations for partially hyperbolic attractors with mostly contracting central directions, PhD thesis, IMPA (1998).

[Cas02] A. Castro, Backward inducing and exponential decay of correlations for partially hyperbolic attractors, *Israel J. Math.* **130**, 29-75 (2002).

[Cas04] A. Castro, Fast mixing for attractors with mostly contracting central direction, *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.* **24**, 17-44 (2004).

[CV13] A. Castro, P. Varandas. Equilibrium states for non-uniformly expanding maps: decay of correlations and strong stability. Annales de I'Institut Henri Poincaré - Analyse non Lineaire, 30:2, 225-249, 2013

[CFT15] V. Climenhaga, T. Fisher and D. Thompson. Unique Equilibrium States for the robustly transitive diffeomorphisms of Mañé and Bonatti-Viana Preprint arXiv:1505.06371.

[DL08] M. Demers and C. Liverani. Stability of statistical properties in two-dimensional piecewise hyperbolic maps. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 360, 4777-4814, 2008.

[GL06] S. Gouezel and C. Liverani. Banach spaces adapted to Anosov systems Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. , 26, 189–217, 2006.

[HP70] W. Hirsch and C. C. Pugh. Stable manifolds and hyperbolic sets. In Global analysis, Proc. Sympos. PureMath. Vol. XIV, (Berkeley, Calif., 1968), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1970, pp. 133–163.

[HPS77] M. Hirsch, C. Pugh and M. Shub, Invariant manifolds. *Lect. Notes in Math.* vol. 583, 1977. Springer Verlag, Berlin.

[LM13] S. Luzzatto and I. Melbourne. Statistical properties and decay of correlations for interval maps with critical points and singularities. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 320 21-35 (2013).

[LR06] R. Leplaideur and I. Rios. Invariant manifolds and equilibrium states for non-uniformly hyperbolic horseshoes. *Nonlinearity*, 19:2667–2694, 2006.

[Li95] C. Liverani, Decay of correlations, *Annals of Math.*, 142, 239–301, 1995.

[LSV98] C. Liverani, B. Saussol and S. Vaienti. Conformal measure and decay of correlation for covering weighted systems. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.*, 18:6, 1399–1420, 1998.

[LT15] C. Liverani, D. Terhesiu Mixing for some non-uniformly hyperbolic systems. To appear in Annales Henri Poincar. Preprint arXiv:1308.2422v2.

[Mane] R. Mañé Introdução à Teoria Ergódica *Projeto Euclides*, Instituto de Matemática Pura e Aplicada, Livros Técnicos e Científicos Editora, 1983.

[Mane78] Contributions to the stability conjecture. *Topology*, 17(4):383-396, 1978.

[Mel14] I. Melbourne Mixing for Invertible Dynamical Systems with Infinite Measure. *Stochastics & Dynamics*, 15, 2015.

[MT14] I. Melbourne and D. Terhesiu. Decay of correlations for nonuniformly expanding systems with general return times. *Ergodic Theory Dyn. Syst* , 34, 893-918, 2014.

[OV08] K. Oliveira and M. Viana. Thermodynamical formalism for an open classes of potentials and non-uniformly hyperbolic maps. *Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys.*, 28, 2008.

[Pin08] V. Pinheiro. Expanding measures. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré- Analyse Non-Lineaire*, v. 28, p. 889-939, 2011.

[SV09] M. Sambarino and C. Vásquez. Bowen measure for derived from Anosov diffeomorphims. Preprint arXiv:0904.1036

[Sar99] O. Sarig. Thermodynamic formalism for countable Markov shifts. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 19:1565–1593, 1999.

[Sin72] Ya. Sinai. Gibbs measures in ergodic theory. *Russian Math. Surveys*, 27:21–69, 1972.

[Ur12] R. Ures, Intrinsic ergodicity of partially hyperbolic diffeomorphisms with a hyperbolic linear part Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 140 (2012)

[VV10] P. Varandas and M. Viana, Existence, uniqueness and stability of equilibrium states for non-uniformly expanding maps, *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré- Analyse Non-Linaire*, 27:555–593, 2010.

[Vi97] M. Viana, Stochastic dynamics of deterministic systems, *Colóquio Brasileiro de Matemática*, 1997.

[W93] Walters P. An Introduction To Ergodic Theory. Springer-Verlag

[Yur03] M. Yuri. Thermodynamical formalism for countable to one Markov systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 335:2949–2971, 2003.

[You98] L.-S. Young. Statistical properties of dynamical systems with some hyperbolicity. *Ann. of Math.*, 147, no. 3, 585D-650, 1998.

Armando Castro, Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Av. Ademar de Barros s/n, 40170-110, Salvador-Ba, Brazil.

E-mail address: armando@impa.br

Teófilo Nascimento, Departamento de Ciências Exatas e da Terra - Campus II, Universidade do Estado da Bahia, Br 110, km 03, 48.040 -210, Alagoinhas-Ba, Brazil.

E-mail address: atnascimento@uneb.br